IMPERIAL CONFERENCE

1923

APPENDICES

TO THE

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

OTTAWA
F. A. ACLAND
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1924

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

TO THE

APPENDICES

1953

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE

LIST OF APPENDICES

	Page
I.—Opening Speeches, October 1, 1923	5
1. Prime Minister of Great Britain	5
2. Prime Minister of Canada	12
3. Prime Minister of New Zealand	14
4. Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa	14
5. President of the Executive Council, Irish Free State	17
6. Prime Minister of Newfoundland	18
7. His Highness the Maharajah of Alwar, on behalf of the Indian Delegation	18
II.—Statement by the Secretary of State for the Colonies as to the Colonies, Protectorates, and Mandated Territories, October 3, 1923	20
III.—Statements by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs as Regards the Turkish Treaty and the Reparations Problem, October 5, 1923	29
1. Turkish Treaty	29
2. Reparations Problem	34
IV.—Speeches regarding the Work of the League of Nations, October 11, 1923	38
1. Lord Privy Seal	38
2. Prime Minister of Canada	48
3. Minister of Justice, Canada	48
4. Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia	49
5. Prime Minister of New Zealand	50
6. Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa	51
7. Minister of Education, Irish Free State	53
8. Prime Minister of Newfoundland	54
9. Secretary of State for India, as Head of the Indian Delegation	55
V.—Speeches regarding the Position of Indians in other Parts of the Empire, October 24, October 29, and October 31, 1923	56
(For full list of speakers, see page 56.)	
Annexe (A).—Memorandum prepared in the Colonial Office as to the political status of British Indians in the Colonies, Protectorates and Mandated Territories	114
Annexe (B).—Memorandum by the Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa	116
VI.—Papers regarding Nationality Questions	118
1. Memorandum prepared by the Commonwealth Government	118
2. Joint Memorandum prepared in the Home Office and Colonial Office as to the grant of naturalization to persons resident in Mandated Territories	120
3. Memorandum prepared in the Home Office as to the nationality of married women	122
4. Validity of marriages between British subjects and foreigners: correspondence with the Governor General of the Commonwealth of Australia	124
VII.—Address by His Highness the Maharajah of Alwar on the Dussehra Festival, October 19, 1923	126
VIII.—Reply from His Majesty the King, Emperor of India, to the Address from the Conference	127

(For full List of the Representatives at the Conference, see pp. 4–5 of Cmd. 1987.)

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE, 1923

Appendices to the Summary of Proceedings

APPENDIX I.

OPENING SPEECHES, OCTOBER 1, 1923

OPENING SPEECH BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN

WELCOME TO OVERSEA REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. STANLEY BALDWIN: I have great pleasure in extending to you all a very hearty welcome to Great Britain. General Smuts and Mr. Massey are no strangers to this historic Council Chamber. They took an important part in the deliberations of the last Conference, and indeed in those of all similar meetings held here since 1917. The same is true of Lord Curzon. The rest of us, with the exception of Mr. Burton, are, I believe, here for the first time at an Imperial gathering of representatives of Great Britain, the Dominions and India.

I have at the outset to draw your attention to the enlargement which has taken place in the circle of the Imperial Conference by the constitution last year of the Irish Free State. I am sure you will wish that I should, on behalf of all His Majesty's Governments who have in the past been entitled to attend these meetings, extend to Mr. Cosgrave, as President of the Free State Executive, and to his colleagues, a cordial welcome on joining our councils.

We welcome Mr. Mackenzie King, and we shall rely on him to continue the high traditions of his predecessors. Especially shall we be glad to benefit by his knowledge of industrial problems. Mr. Warren is almost as new to his high office as I am to mine, but he is no stranger to this country. Nor is Mr. de Wet, to whom also I extend the cordial greeting. Mr. Bruce is unable to be with us at the opening of our deliberations, but we shall welcome him a few days hence.

It is a great pleasure to have with us distinguished representatives of the Indian Empire in the persons of His Highness the Maharajah of Alwar and Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru. His Highness is widely known as an enlightened ruler deeply interested in the educational and material progress of his State—a State which rendered valuable help in men and money during the war. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru has long been a conspicuous figure in Indian public life, and we recognize in him a brilliant lawyer and wise statesman.

GERMAN REPARATION AND RUHR OCCUPATION

In his review of the state of the world at the opening of the last Conference in the summer of 1921, the British Prime Minister struck on the whole a moderately hopeful note. At home he observed a sense of strain and exhaus-

tion after the prolonged struggle of the war; there was labour unrest and unemployment, though no actual privation amongst our people. Abroad there was turmoil and tension, but some of the most troublesome and menacing problems of the peace had either been settled or were in a fair way of settlement. One of these was the disarmament of Germany, the other was reparation. The former was in process of being accomplished. The schedule of reparation liabilities drawn up in accordance with the Treaty of Versailles by the Reparation Commission had been forwarded to the German Government on the 5th May, 1921. When Mr. Lloyd George spoke six weeks later it had been accepted by Germany, so that, as he told his colleagues at this table, the two most troublesome problems were either settled or in a very fair way of being adjusted. Nowhere is prophecy more difficult than in politics, and especially in the field of foreign affairs.

As is well known, it proved impossible to hold Germany to the fulfilment of her reparation obligations under the scheme evolved in May, 1921. The Allies at various times granted alleviations and postponements, but the German payments grew ever less, until at the end of last year we were faced with the possibility of total default. Definite proposals for a complete and final settlement were made in January last by Mr. Bonar Law. These proposals involved heavy sacrifice by the British taxpayer in the direction of writing off debts for which we hold the unconditional obligations of our Allies. Our proposals would involve the writing off of the greater part of the Allied obligations amounting to over £1,200 million sterling and leaving the British taxpayer to face the resulting burden without himself receiving payment. We deeply regret that so generous an offer to effect a final settlement did not receive more favourable consideration.

This difficult problem of reparation was complicated by a difference of opinion amongst the Allies as to the measures to be taken to secure the payment of what was due to them. It need scarcely be emphasized that there was no difference of opinion whatever on the principle that Germany should be made to pay to the utmost limit of her ability. The French and Belgian Governments decided to seize and exploit the Ruhr Valley, and they claimed that, Germany having been reported in voluntary default by the Reparation Commission, they were entitled to do this under the Treaty of Versailles. His Majesty's Government could not share this view, and were, moreover, convinced that such action could not but prejudice the prospects of the Allies ultimately securing the bulk of reparation. The French and Belgian Governments, however, with the acquiescence, though not very active support, of the Italian Government, proceeded to put their plan into execution. His Majesty's Government decided that, being convinced of the inexpediency of such action, they could take no part in the execution of the Franco-Belgian measures. The German Government, refusing to recognise the legality of the occupation, ordered and organised passive resistance, which has been practised up till now, and has, in its turn, called forth ever stronger measures on the part of the occupying authorities. His Majesty's Government have had no easy task, while remaining in occupation of part of the Rhineland, in carrying out their policy of neither helping nor hindering the action of their Allies, but they dare to hope that they have succeeded in the main in maintaining an attitude of strict neutrality. The Notes which have been exchanged between us and the French Government since the January Conference have more and more revealed an honest divergence of opinion as to the best method of obtaining reparation and of advancing the cause of permanent peace in Europe. That divergence reflects differences of temperament and outlook between the two nations which it would be foolish to ignore, but the last twenty years have shown that they are not incompatible with whole-hearted co-operation in the face of grave danger.

We have strained every nerve to preserve the solidarity of the Allies and especially the Entente with France. We have done this believing that any rupture between us might still further postpone the peace which Europe so sorely needs. I am aware that the patience we have shown in trying to preserve good relations with France has laid us open in many quarters to the charges of indecision and weakness. But at least it has borne witness not only to our wish to act, in the words of Disraeli, as " a moderating and mediatorial Power " in the Councils of Europe, but to our ardent desire to preserve our friendship with France.

At this moment it seems that we are entering on a new phase with the collapse of German passive resistance, which appeared to be imminent when I met the French Prime Minister in Paris not many days ago. How the new situation will develop I shall not venture to predict, but one thing was clear to us in Paris, and becomes daily clearer; it is only by the closest co-operation and complete confidence of the Allies in each other that we can hope for a settlement of Europe's difficulties.

A fuller and a more detailed statement of the situation will be made to you by the Foreign Secretary when we come later on in the week to the discussion of foreign affairs.

THE JANINA MURDERS AND OCCUPATION OF CORFU

Within the last few weeks, we have been faced by a sudden crisis in the relations between Greece and Italy which threatened at one moment to assume serious proportions, but which, I am glad to say, has now been settled. I do not desire to anticipate what will be said later upon this subject, but I wish in my present speech to call your particular attention to the very useful and, in my opinion, effective part played in this crisis by the League of Nations. I am aware that there are many people who consider that the League has missed a very obvious opportunity of establishing its prestige in quarters where it has hitherto been either derided or ignored. The temptation to react dramatically and violently to the present crisis is one to which a less statesmanlike body than the League Council might pardonably have succumbed. I consider that the members of the Council deserve the greatest credit for having placed the permanent interests of peace above what might have seemed the immediate interests of the League itself. And in this moderation they have been amply justified; there is no single person possessing real knowledge of the recent crisis or any settled experience of similar crises in the past, who does not realize to-day that, had the League not existed and acted as it did, a resort to arms would almost inevitably have taken place, and that, had the Council not shown the wise discretion for which in some quarters they have been assailed, the outcome of the crisis might have been very different. The League by its moderation and common sense may temporarily have disappointed the expectations of its more ardent and impetuous supporters, but the exhibition of these qualities in very trying circumstances has strengthened its hold upon the confidence of reasoning men in all countries.

I think we have every reason to be satisfied with the part played by our Delegations at Geneva in contributing to this happy result.

TREATY OF LAUSANNE

Peace with Turkey was signed at Lausanne on the 24th July last, after a Conference lasting seven months, with a suspension of sittings from the 2nd February to the 20th April. Various reasons—the delays of the Paris Peace

Conference, political changes in Greece, the difficulty of maintaining a united Allied policy, the development of a strong military and nationalist movement in Turkey—compelled us to negotiate a treaty with Turkey on a different basis and of a different nature from those concluded with our other enemies of 1914. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs will shortly explain to you in greater detail the genesis of the treaty and its main lines, but I think that after hearing his statement you will agree with me that, broadly speaking, this treaty not only safeguards the essential interests of the British Empire, without damage to British prestige, but has done something to reconcile those different national and religious interests which have so often troubled this quarter of the world, and may have laid the foundation of a period of comparative tranquility and economic reconstruction.

DEBT TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Thanks largely to a mutual determination to arrive at an agreement, arrangements have been concluded with the Government of the United States of America for the gradual repayment over a long period of the sums we borrowed from that Government to ensure the successful prosecution of the war. It must be remembered that on our debt we were liable, apart from any question of repayment, to pay 5 per cent—amounting to over 200 million dollars—for interest alone. The funding arrangement has reduced the burden for interest and repayment combined to 161 million dollars per annum. The burden, despite the various provisions intended to assist us in shouldering it, is very heavy; it amounts to 7*d.* in the £ on income tax; it equals three-quarters of our total receipts from that tax before the war. The repayment of this debt is going to call for all our energies. But we considered that funding the debt was the only possible course consistent with the supreme standard of British credit; and that it was an essential preliminary to the restoration of the normal economic life of the world. The debts of Great Nations must be recognized if the foundations of commercial progress are to stand.

IMPERIAL DEFENCE

It will be remembered that when the last Imperial Conference was held in 1921 the chief question with regard to Imperial defence under consideration was the future of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance and its bearing on the relations of the British Empire with the United States.

WASHINGTON CONFERENCE

It was during these discussions, which extended over several days, that the invitation from the President of the United States for a Conference on Disarmament was received.

The Conference on Limitation of Armaments assembled in Washington in November, 1921. I do not think I exaggerate if I say that the results achieved exceeded our most sanguine anticipations. If these were due in great part to the dramatic proposals with which the United States Government confronted the Conference at its opening meeting, by general admission they were also in no small degree attributable to the skill, tact and diplomacy of Lord Balfour, ably assisted by the delegates from the Dominions and India.

It may not be out of place to remind you that these results included:—

1. The Treaty for the Limitation of Naval Armament.
2. The Quadruple Pacific Treaty.
3. The Nine-Power Treaty regarding China.

4. The Nine-Power Treaty regarding the Chinese Customs Tariff.
5. The Treaty for the protection of the lives of Neutrals and Non-combatants at sea in time of war and to prevent the use in war of noxious gases and chemicals.
6. Many supplementary Resolutions and Declarations.

I think we may justifiably claim that these results which are not only a real benefit but also contain a promise in the future for the whole Empire, are in no small measure due, first, to the last Imperial Conference, which was so largely concerned in initiating the Washington Conference, and, second, to the British Empire Delegation, which co-operated so successfully with the United States and other Governments in bringing it to fruition.

The ratification of the Quadruple Pacific Treaty has now been completed, and thereupon the agreement concluded between Great Britain and Japan in 1911 automatically terminates.

We have all been deeply moved by the news of the recent earthquake in the East, and I am sure you will wish me to express our profound sympathy with our faithful Ally in the terrible calamity which has befallen her and our recognition of the brave spirit in which she has met it.

AIR DEFENCE

The other chief questions of Imperial Defence which have been dealt with in the interval since the last Conference will be reviewed later by the Lord President of the Council. Problems of Empire Defence will necessarily occupy a considerable share of our deliberations. It will be within your knowledge that we decided with great reluctance to add to our defensive Air Forces. When announcing this increase in our programme to Parliament, I said, and I should like to repeat here, that, in conformity with our obligation under the Covenant of the League of Nations, His Majesty's Government would gladly co-operate with other Governments in limiting the strength of air armaments on lines similar to the Treaty of Washington in the case of the Navy, and any such arrangement, it is needless to say, would govern our policy of air expansion.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The impoverishment of the world consequent on the ravages of the war has been immensely aggravated and prolonged by the unsettlement of Europe which I have described. Contraction of trade in Europe is felt throughout the world, in India, in Canada, in Australia, in South Africa, on all of whom the European market reacts. All countries of the world are burdened by debt, by taxation, by budget difficulties, by exchange fluctuations. We here at home as a great trading and exporting country feel the result with especial severity.

Since the summer of 1921 there has on the whole been some improvement in the state of employment in this country; but unfortunately the numbers unemployed remain still very large, and the depression in trade which revealed itself in the autumn of 1920 has not passed away.

In the spring and early summer of the present year there were signs of an early revival of trade. Unhappily the improvement then promised and partly realized has suffered a check. Recently the figures of unemployed have taken an upward turn, and it is to be feared that this increase will continue during the coming winter months. We have roughly a million and a quarter out of work as compared with a little over a million and a half when the last conference met.

INTER-IMPERIAL TRADE

The efforts of the Government to cope with this situation have been and will continue to be directed on three main lines. In the first place, relief works of a useful and practical kind and costing many millions are set in operation with Treasury assistance through Local Authorities and otherwise. Secondly, provision on an unprecedented scale is made through the National Unemployment Insurance Scheme for those in the insured trades who are unavoidably unemployed; and thirdly, every practicable step is taken to stimulate and encourage the revival of trade at home, with the Dominions, India and the Colonies and with foreign countries.

An Agenda for the Conference has been prepared and it embraces a number of topics in addition to foreign affairs and defence which it is desirable we should examine together, but I think you will agree that one of the most important items on it is this question of inter-Imperial trade. The whole subject will be gone into by the Economic Conference under the Chairmanship of my friend, the President of the Board of Trade, and we shall have before us here some of the major questions which are involved. I am confident that we shall be able to devise measures which will be to our mutual advantage by way of redistributing the population, improving transport and means of communication, and, generally, increasing the facilities for the growth of trade within the Empire.

The economic condition of Europe makes it essential that we should turn our eyes elsewhere. The resources of our Empire are boundless and the need for rapid development is clamant. I trust that we shall not separate before we have agreed upon the first steps to be taken to create in a not too distant future an ample supply of those raw materials on which the trade of the world depends. Population necessarily follows such extension, and that in its turn leads to a general expansion of business from which alone can come an improvement in the material condition of the people.

INDIA

Upon the peculiar problems presented by India I do not now propose to dwell, however briefly. Doubtless they will be authoritatively interpreted to us, as occasion arises, by the Members of the Indian Delegation. But it does seem to me important to remember that this great country stands at the moment in special need of all the sympathetic understanding we can give her. She is engaged, under British guidance, in the stupendous task of educating one-fifth of the human race to the burdens and privileges of responsible government; and the period of transition between the old tradition régime and the emergence of self-governing institutions must necessarily be both delicate and difficult. Moreover, her relationship with other component elements in the British Commonwealth presents a problem at once complex and critical, for in it are involved the contact of civilizations, so varied in history and tradition, and the future harmony of East and West. I am convinced that we may look with confidence for the co-operation, not merely of the peoples of India themselves, but also, in so far as may lie in their power, of the Dominion Governments.

CLOSING SURVEY

Contemplating Europe as we do to-day, and comparing what we see with what we hoped for three or four years ago, we can find little to encourage us in our labours. The size of armies and the money spent on munitions are greater than in 1914. Economic solidarity is rent asunder. Is it not amazing that

after an exhausting world-wide war all efforts should not be directed to reconstruction, to the building up of the wealth spent in war and waste, and to the recreation of the economic machinery which war has put out of joint? The only consolations I can draw in a situation so charged with unrest are to recall the history of the past and to reflect on the unity of our own Empire and the deep and universal desire of our people for peace.

All the great European wars have been followed by a recrudescence of militarism and the nations have taken far more years to recover from the shock of war than the years which separate us from the Treaty of Versailles. It took France a couple of centuries to recover from the Hundred Years' War; a long and dreary period followed the Thirty Years' War, in Germany. The years which followed Waterloo were among the darkest in our national history. After the Congress of Vienna there was no organized demand for schemes of disarmament.

Compared with a century ago, we have, at least within limits, a League of Nations, and no one can have studied the transactions of its Assembly at Geneva without becoming aware of a growing international moral sense, and a determination to confront the problems of the reduction of armaments, difficult as they must be. What can be achieved by international co-operation and reconstruction on sound economic lines is shown in the case of Austria, where nine Governments have joined to guarantee a loan. No one who knew Austria eighteen months ago would recognize the new spirit which now prevails there. Compared with a century ago, there is a powerful friend of peace in the United States. In this room on this occasion it is natural that we should be most conscious of that League of Nations in whose name we are assembled—the British Commonwealth—that system of States spread all over the world, far greater, as General Smuts once truly said, than any Empire which has ever existed, "a dynamic system growing, evolving all the time towards new destinies."

THE BRITISH EMPIRE

The British Empire, whose representatives are assembled here to-day, has often been described as the product of accidents. It is, in fact, the natural and spontaneous product not of its own necessities only, but of those of mankind. Scarcely four centuries have passed since the continents of the world swung like new planets into each other's ken. When Columbus discovered America and Vasco da Gama opened the routes to the East, all nations and kindreds of the earth were presently brought into intimate contact. A few years later a political writer of the sixteenth century remarked: "Henceforth the world is one Commonwealth." In a sense his words were prophetic. Our ever increasing control of natural forces has so knit the nations together that whatever affects one for good or ill affects them all. They are as organs of one body. But the mastery achieved over physical forces has completely outdistanced the control acquired over human forces. The fact is that our minds learn far more quickly than our characters change; so the social and political structure of the world has not kept pace with the growth of its knowledge. I am not saying that no progress has been made in applying moral ideas to political facts. Before me I see men who together can speak for a world commonwealth containing one-quarter of mankind. The peoples you represent are drawn from all the continents, from all their races, from every kind of human society. Like a network of steel embedded in concrete this Commonwealth holds more than itself together. It held through the greatest cataclysm that has ever shaken the foundations of the world. Dissolve those ties and civilization itself would collapse.

We are often told that self-interest binds the Empire together. A half truth presented as the whole is a dangerous falsehood. I have likened the ties which unite us to steel, but steel of the wrong temper may be brittle as glass. The only element which can give a tensile quality to human ties is a sense of duty in men to each other. We, gathered in this chamber, will strengthen the bonds which unite us so far as we are able to keep in mind the needs of others than those for whom we speak. We stand here on an equal footing and no Government present in this chamber can bind the rest. We can act with effect so far as we agree, and no further; but I weigh my words when I say that we shall achieve agreement and so strengthen the bonds which unite us only in so far as each and all of us is seeking how to relieve not only our own difficulties and troubles, but those also of a distracted world. The British Empire cannot live for itself alone. Its strength as a Commonwealth of Nations will grow so far as its members unite to bear on their shoulders the burdens of those weaker and less fortunate than themselves.

OPENING SPEECH BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

Mr. Mackenzie King: Prime Minister and Gentlemen: The Prime Minister in his opening remarks made reference to precedents which have been established at former gatherings. I understand that the representative of the senior Dominion has been the first to speak after the Prime Minister of Great Britain. In these circumstances, I venture to say just a word or two. Personally I could not but wish that one of the more experienced and older members of the gathering had been the first to address his remarks to this Conference, my friend Mr. Massey, or General Smuts, who have been at similar gatherings in the past; but it may be well that precedents should be observed, and the procedure at former Conferences followed.

WELCOME TO REPRESENTATIVES OF IRISH FREE STATE

May I thank the Prime Minister very cordially for the heartiness of the welcome which he has extended to us? I am sure we all join with him in experiencing pleasure at the presence at this gathering of the representatives of the Irish Free State. Coming from the Dominion of Canada, the close association of the name of our Dominion with that of the new Irish Free State in the Treaty and Constitution makes it a special pleasure to me to have the privilege of meeting at this table the representatives of that State.

COMMENTS ON MR. BALDWIN'S SPEECH

Having regard to the short time we expect to occupy this morning, it would scarcely, I think, be advisable for me in any way to attempt to comment upon the clear, comprehensive review which has been made by the Prime Minister of the situation in Europe, and the mention made of other parts of the world, except to say that the information which has been given to us to-day, and particularly the elevated note which has been struck, will, I believe, be welcome not only to members of this gathering, but to the countries that are represented here, and, indeed, should be helpful in the wider field of international relations. The subjects that have been touched on are, of course, among the most important with which the British Empire is concerned, the issues with which they deal and to which they give rise are far-reaching, and it would not be advisable therefore to attempt to comment in any particular upon any phase of the questions at this stage. During the sittings of the Conference I assume ample opportunity will be afforded to all of us to make such references and comment as we may think would be necessary and helpful.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 37a

VALUE OF IMPERIAL CONFERENCES AND OF PERSONAL CONSULTATION

I feel it is a very great privilege to have the opportunity of meeting in this personal way members of the British Government, the heads of the Governments of the Self-Governing Dominions, and the representatives of India, to discuss matters, many of which are of common concern. In matters of government the value of personal contact and association cannot I think be overestimated. Some of the gentlemen present, most in fact, I am having the opportunity of meeting for the first time to-day; some little acquaintance has been formed by correspondence and cables, but I think a personal meeting is worth more than all the cables and correspondence combined. In so far as I have the privilege of speaking for the people of Canada, I would say that at this Conference we have only one aim and purpose, that, namely, which actuates all of us, of meeting together with a view to being mutually helpful, in doing what we can towards solving as far as may be possible many of the great problems wheih are of concern to us all. I think as we each speak our minds clearly with reference to matters in which some of us have perhaps a special interest and to other matters of general interest, we will find that no problem is incapable of being at least in some way appreciably solved if the spirit of goodwill is present, as it is certain to be in this gathering.

VALUE OF PUBLICITY

May I just say this one word—it is a thought which has come to me more forcibly as I have listened to the Prime Minister's review—important as it is that those of us who represent Governments and are members of Governments should have the information which has been given to us to-day, and should have a common understanding among ourselves, more important I believe it to be that the Parliaments of the Empire should have equal advantage, as far as may be possible, of the fullest information with respect to such matters as are of concern to us all, and not only the Parliaments, but still more important, I would say, as far as this can be attained, the peoples of the various Dominions from which we come. For that reason I am glad of the publicity which is to be given to to-day's proceedings.

As a common sentiment, a common feeling, is developed among the peoples of the component parts of the British Empire, the solution of the questions that arise will be found appreciably easier. I can think of no greater service any of us could find it possible to render than that perhaps of taking back to our Parliaments, and through our Parliaments transmitting to our people, much of the information which we will gather here, information which will be helpful in interpreting to those whom we represent the difficulties and problems with which other parts are concerned. Similarly, I feel positive that no contribution can be rendered to this gathering of greater value or of greater permanent worth than that as representatives we should seek not merely to express our own individual views, but, so far as we can do it, set forth the views of our Parliaments and the views of the people represented in our Parliaments, with reference to the affairs of the Empire, and of the different countries that compose it.

EMPIRE STANDS FOR PEACE

I think, Prime Minister, that throughout the British Dominions there will be very great satisfaction at the emphasis which you have placed upon the desire which actuates us all here, not only to further goodwill and harmonious relations between the different parts of the Empire, in working out our own problems, but also to make what contribution we can towards peace and justice

in the world. That, I think, is the pride we all feel in the British Empire, that it has stood for peace, justice and goodwill among men, and, in so far as we can make a contribution that will be of benefit to mankind, it seems to me that it will come in largest measure through the circumstance that, representing different countries, scattered in different parts of the globe, we nevertheless are all one in our aims and in our purpose, and that the purpose which you have just set forth in such eloquent terms.

OPENING SPEECH BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF NEW ZEALAND

Mr. Massey: Prime Minister, I do not intend at present to comment upon matters to which you have referred in the very clear and very exhaustive statement which you have just given to the Conference. I say that because I think better and more suitable opportunities will offer later on, and I would just like to express a hope that before this Conference comes to an end we shall be able to do something definite and satisfactory in the way of solving as many as possible of the problems that have arisen during the last few years. I just wish to join with you, Prime Minister, and with the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Mackenzie King, in the welcome which you have extended to each and every one of the new members who have appeared at the Conference table to-day for the first time. I have no doubt they will be able to do good work, and as one of the older members I can say for myself, and I know General Smuts will join with me, we shall be very pleased to have their assistance in the many matters that are certain to be brought before us during the next six weeks or two months.

OPENING SPEECH BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

WELCOME TO REPRESENTATIVES OF IRISH FREE STATE

General Smuts: Prime Minister, I join with my colleagues here in expressing with what great interest we have listened to you. I also join with them in welcoming our friends from Ireland to this Conference. You have painted a very dark picture of the present state of affairs in Europe, and yet the presence of the Free State here goes to show what the spirit of goodwill can effect. Two years ago, when we had our last Imperial Conference, the state of affairs in Ireland was about as black as anything which exists in Europe to-day; but the difficulties were resolutely grappled with and as a result we have the Irish Free State represented here at this great Conference, sitting at this Board of our Commonwealth and collaborating with us on the problems which face us all. A case like this is to me a proof that nothing is really as bad as it looks nor perhaps is Europe as bad as it looks. I join most heartily and most sincerely in welcoming our friend President Cosgrave here to-day. He will find in this Conference, I am sure, sympathy and support from all of us. The difficulties which Ireland has passed through and will continue to pass through are difficulties which are not peculiar to her. He will find that many of those questions which confront Ireland are common to the whole Empire. Here he will find help and assistance and sympathy in the consideration of his own problems, and he will find that this Conference, this High Court of our great Commonwealth, is the best forum for the discussion of his problems.

I am very glad that Mr. Massey has been able to come. I know he has had to face great difficulties in coming. However, he has triumphed, as he always does, and I hope that, now we shall have a full Conference, we shall be able to do really good work and that a real advance will be registered on this occasion.

SITUATION IN EUROPE

This is a most important and solemn occasion in the history of our great Commonwealth. The picture which the Prime Minister has painted to us to-day in his able and interesting speech is a very black one. The world is undoubtedly in a bad way. Instead of the peoples drawing together as we hoped they would after the War the tendencies are the other way, the passions which the War has let loose are still rampant everywhere, and if ever there was a time when a helping hand was needed by the world, and Europe especially, it is now. Our Commonwealth is still there; it has stood many a storm; it has laid down many a great precedent in the history of the world; and the present situation in Europe more than any previous one calls for a great united effort on its part. I trust it will really pull its weight and make a great contribution to the solution of the questions which are confronting the world.

WASHINGTON CONFERENCE

You are right, Prime Minister, in pointing out what was achieved with regard to the Washington Conference. There is no doubt that the inception of the Washington Conference was brought about in this Chamber. It originated here in our deliberations, and owing to the subsequent great initiative of the Government of the United States.

That Conference marked greater advance for peace than any other Conference which has been held after the war. In that way the last Imperial Conference became very fruitful. I hope that this Conference will be as fruitful, and even more fruitful, in the contributions which it will make towards a settlement of the questions which are now distracting the world.

With regard to the Empire questions to which you have referred, I am sure that in one way and another they are all capable of solutions. At least, we can, as Mr. King has said, make an advance toward their solution. The spirit of goodwill and friendship in which we meet here makes every question soluble. We can register an advance even if we cannot arrive at definite solutions. In saying this, I do not wish to enter into a discussion of details: we will do that as the Conference progresses.

Mr. BALDWIN: Yes, on Friday.

POWER OF THE EMPIRE

GENERAL SMUTS: Yes, Friday. I await the statements of the Foreign Secretary and other gentlemen who are going to address us. But let me say this here and now; I have the feeling that our Commonwealth is a very great and powerful one. The British Empire can exert a force such as possibly no other agency on earth to-day to pull the world together, and I am anxious, so far as it can be done with goodwill and firmness, that whatever influence there is in this Empire, this greatest machine on earth, should be used to the full in order to assist the settlement of Europe. We have no reason to speak with bated breath. For centuries this country has, on every critical occasion in the history of Europe, spoken with the voice of authority, and the other Nations have always in the end had to listen to that voice.

My feeling and my desire is that on a unique occasion like this, without using threats or violent language, and in a spirit of complete goodwill, we should once more do what has been done before and speak with a voice that will be listened to in the affairs of the world. I am not going into details now because we shall come to them later in the course of the week.

JANINA MURDERS AND OCCUPATION OF CORFU. POSITION OF LEAGUE OF NATIONS

You have made reference to the League, and I agree with what you have said. At the same time, I think there is much misunderstanding as to what happened quite recently at Geneva. I have the feeling that the League has strengthend its position. The League has in the face of what threatened to be a very grave crisis in Europe acted with moderation and wisdom.

But the general view is that the crisis in Southern Europe has constituted a check for the League. The impression is that the League in a first-class crisis has not pulled its weight and has been inefficient, and whatever good work there was was done by other agencies. It is most important to clear up the position and remove this erroneous impression. I hope Lord Robert Cecil, when he comes back, will be able to explain to this Conference what has really happened. It would be lamentable that the impression should gather that the League has been pushed aside. Our object should be to strengthen the League and support it in every way; there is nothing else to do. If there were some other ageney holding the nations together and working for peace, I would back that up. It is not a question of any particular form. So far we have devised one form and one form only for holding the nations together in a brotherhood of peace. As the real nature and interest of the British Empire is peace, I think we should support the League to the full and strengthen her hands as far as possible and add whatever weight we can to her counsels. I hope the misunderstanding which exists at present will be cleared up and that people will recognize that the League has really come with credit out of the Italian business.

DEBT TO UNITED STATES

As regards the American debt, I have expressed my cordial agreement with what you have done in funding that debt. The British Empire carries out its contracts. At the same time, I fear that, unless there is a real recovery of the world, unless you can succeed in re-establishing the trade and commerce of the world, you may find that you have undertaken an intolerable burden for this country. What you have done should therefore be followed up with equal decision in a great attempt to restore the trade conditions of Europe. Otherwise you may find that what you have undertaken is perhaps more than this nation can bear. Some people seem to regard their debts very lightly nowadays. I am glad that the British Government has been consistent. At the beginning of the war in 1914, it insisted on the fulfilment of International obligations. It staked the existence of the whole Empire on that. Similarly after the war, you said, we shall honour our bond and pay. That is right and proper as a policy, but, at the same time, think it would be almost an intolerable burden to this people unless you can really have peace in the world.

NEED FOR PEACE IN EUROPE

Our duty, therefore, not only to the world, but to this people who are going to carry this obligation, is to move heaven and earth in having peace re-established in Europe. Some people think that Europe does not concern us, that it is mere philanthropy or meddlesomeness to concern ourselves with her affairs, that we should leave Europe alone in her present stress. That attitude seems to me quite hopeless. You cannot have even the possibility of paying your American

debt unless you can restore peaceful conditions in Europe. We can go far to extend Empire trade, and I hope that everything will be done to do so. Without any revolutionary departure from the settled fiscal policy of this country, I think a great deal can be done to foster inter-Empire trade, and I hope that this Conference will register a very great advance in that direction. But it will naturally take many years before the British Empire could take the place of Europe in your trade. In the meantime, you will have to carry all your burdens; you have to carry the present internal burdens and also to carry the weight of this intolerable external debt. It is clear to me you will not be able to do it unless peaceful conditions are restored in Europe. I do not want to say any more, Prime Minister. I only wish that this Conference will be successful—that it will achieve not only the objects it has in view with regard to the Empire, but also with regard to that larger and more difficult situation which confronts us in Europe. It is not only you who wish to re-establish trade—we in the outer Empire want to do the same. We also had our markets in Europe, and they are largely gone. Therefore, even if there were no higher motive than mere self-interest, we should still try our very best to establish conditions of peace and quiet in Europe. But there is much more. Deeper human motives appeal to us. The same motives that carried us into the war continue to guide us in the peace. It is quite impossible for us to disinterest ourselves in the awful conditions which exist all around us as a result of the war. We shall require much patience, and it may be that it will take much longer than we thought possible to have the world restored to normal conditions. Let us exercise patience, but at the same time let us really pull our weight. There is a rapid worsening of conditions all over Europe. It may be that this will still continue for years and become an irremediable set-back to Western civilization. Even at this moment fundamental changes are taking place in Europe which will largely affect the future status and relations of the nations. I only hope that it may be possible to stay the rot before things have gone too far.

OPENING SPEECH BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, IRISH FREE STATE

ACKNOWLEDGES WELCOME EXTENDED TO REPRESENTATIVES OF IRISH FREE STATE

Mr. Cosgrave: Prime Minister, I wish to express my very real appreciation of the welcome you have extended to us and of the pleasing references you have made to our inclusion in this Conference. I also appreciate very highly the cordial welcome extended to us by Mr. King, Mr. Massey and General Smuts, and the great interest in Ireland shown by General Smuts in his speech. He is perhaps the best able to appreciate the difficulties through which we have passed, as he also gave ready and most valuable assistance to bring about the position which leads to our presence here to-day.

POSITION OF FREE STATE

In your statement, Sir, you have referred to problems which, both in size and number, overshadow our own immediate difficulties, and it gives us hope that, besides settling our own affairs, we may give some assistance in the solution of problems affecting the whole world. We come to this Conference in good faith, with an earnest desire to render what assistance we can in the solution of the problems to be faced, and to carry out with good faith and goodwill our part of that undertaking which you on your side have faithfully honoured in the

past, realizing that it is only in the exercise of these great attributes that it is possible for us to reach the desired end. This business is new to us and it is not possible for us to express opinions upon the many great and important matters which have been mentioned in your speech. The troubles and difficulties of our present situation and the circumstances surrounding it make my immediate association with the Conference less than I would wish. You, Prime Minister, will appreciate that, and I am sure His Grace the Duke of Devonshire will do so also. I would say it is a very real pleasure for me to be here and to have witnessed such a cordial and wholehearted reception. We realize our responsibilities and we are prepared to take over and shoulder the burdens, which are common burdens. I was very much gratified with the concluding paragraphs of the Prime Minister's speech and with the statement made by General Smuts that the real objective of this Conference is to further the cause of peace.

OPENING SPEECH BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF NEWFOUNDLAND

WELCOME TO REPRESENTATIVES OF IRISH FREE STATE

Mr. Warren: Prime Minister and Gentlemen, I just desire to thank you, Sir, for the very cordial welcome that I have received. Perhaps as representing Britain's first-born, it might come well from me to congratulate the newest Dominion, the Free State, and to assure Mr. Cosgrave, on behalf of Newfoundland, that he has many of his countrymen there who have the greatest sympathy for him, and they all sincerely hope that he may be successful in the task he has undertaken.

POSITION OF NEWFOUNDLAND

I should like to say, Sir, that the fact that I am here at all is a sign of what Great Britain has always stood for. I represent a small community, but we have never been impelled, coerced, not even, as far as I know, asked, to merge our political independence into that of a larger Dominion. We have been allowed to plough our own furrow and we have every confidence that we shall be allowed to do so in the future. Perhaps after I have attended as many Conferences as my friend on my right, Mr. Massey, I may be able to speak with more confidence than I do this morning. I have to thank him for his reference to us. We all know that among Dominion Prime Ministers he is the father of us all and, sitting as I do so close to him, I hope that I may learn from him how to acquire a title to Prime Ministership by prescription. There are a vast number of people looking to this Conference and looking to us to show some results. I feel sure that we are all imbued with one idea, and that is to do everything we can to achieve the results which are expected of us, and I am sure that we are all ready to make any sacrifice that may lead to those results.

OPENING SPEECH BY HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJAH OF ALWAR, ON BEHALF OF THE INDIAN DELEGATION

Lord Peel: Prime Minister, I will ask my colleague, His Highness the Maharajah of Alwar, to reply for the Indian Delegation.

THE MAHARAJAH OF ALWAR: Prime Minister of Great Britain, your Lordships and Gentlemen, I come to-day as the nominated representative of the Princes of India. You know that they rule over one-third of the Indian Empire and most of them are connected by treaties and engagements with the British Crown; but they are perhaps best known for their united loyalty and attachment to the Throne.

To-day, however, I am privileged to speak in the name of the 300 millions of peoples of my country. I speak on behalf of one of the oldest civilizations within the Empire, but who in the race of self-government have still much leeway to make. In the name of India, I thank you, Prime Minister, for the very felicitous terms in which you have extended your welcome to us on behalf of the British Cabinet. I thank you, and through you those on whose behalf you speak, for the expressions of goodwill for my country. I thank you all, friends, for the hopes that have been expressed that the Conference may achieve harmonious results. I can only say that I sincerely share that hope myself and, in conclusion, I trust that it will be permissible for me to thank the Prime Minister for the kind remarks he has made about myself and my State. I appreciate them particularly as I take them to be compliments paid to my Order, through me as their representative.

I will only speak about one word more. On such an occasion as this, I ask myself what is to be our attitude? Surely it is on this factor that the ultimate results of our Conference will mainly depend. The answer I receive to my question is in unhesitating terms. Surely is not this Conference composed of brother delegates from the sister Dominions? We assemble round the hub of the Empire as members of the family of nations, all united in one cause—namely, the uplift of the British Empire—all cemented together by one force, namely, the British Crown.

Gentlemen, the recent great war has left behind its aftermath to which the Prime Minister has given very lucid expression. Wounds and sores are still festering in many parts of the world.

With a little sacrifice, with a little toleration, with a little understanding, all this world can, I believe—and firmly so—still be made a playground for God's children. With a little willingness to give—and it does not require much willingness to take—mountains can certainly be converted into mole-hills.

On the completion of this Conference, I ask myself—would we rather say that we were able to achieve and gain this or that for our individual country or that we were in the privileged position of being able to subscribe, however little or great it was, for the unity of the British Empire. It will be a proud moment indeed if we can subscribe to the latter sentiments eventually. I do not mean to say that there will not be questions during our discussion and deliberations on which there may be differences of opinion, or on which it will be our responsibility to seek gain for our individual territories and nationalities. But in carrying out that responsibility, all we have to remember is that we have something greater to look to than our own country, namely, the British Empire, and that there is something even greater than the British Empire, namely, Humanity. Why is it then that we wish to subscribe our little quota to make that British Empire, which is already great, if possible even greater? It is because we like to believe that it will be, with every individual component part working out its own destiny in mutual harmony with others, and even with all our different nationalities, creeds, castes and religions existing—that the British Empire is going to fulfil its great object of leading humanity, not only towards peace, not only towards right understanding but ultimately towards the great Divinity of which after all each one of us are but active sparks. That at least is my idea for the attitude at our Conference, to fulfil it shall be my endeavour.

APPENDIX II

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES AS TO THE COLONIES, PROTECTORATES AND MANDATED TERRITORIES, OCTOBER 3, 1923

The DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: I understand that it is the general wish of the Conference that, as Secretary of State for the Colonies, I should give a brief account of the manner in which the responsibilities entrusted to the Colonial Office for the Colonies and Protectorates have been discharged during the two years which have passed since the Conference last met. Although the destinies of these great dependencies of the Crown are the immediate responsibility and trust of the British Government, it would be wrong if it were to be supposed that the moral and material progress and development of these large areas were not of increasing importance to all the partners in the British Empire, and it is the constant aim and endeavour of the Colonial Office to foster the interest of the Oversea Dominions in these great territories and so to stimulate inter-Imperial trade.

I do not propose to attempt to deal in any detail with the economic aspects of the Colonial Empire. These aspects, important as they are, come more properly within the purview of the Economic Conference, on which the special interests of the Colonies and Protectorates will be represented and advocated by the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Mr. Ormsby-Gore, who will have associated with him Sir James Stevenson and Sir Gilbert Grindle, aided by an Advisory Committee composed of persons possessed of special and practical experience of the industrial life of the several Colonies and groups of Colonies concerned.

ECONOMIC DEPRESSION SLOWLY LIFTING

In the statement which my predecessor, Mr. Churchill, made to the Conference of 1921 about the Colonies and Protectorates,* he referred to the creeping paralysis which had overtaken almost all their industries after the artificial prosperity of the war period. They still suffer under the general depression of trade, but I think I may say that, taken as a whole, the Colonies are "pulling through." The financial position of some of the smaller Colonies is a constant source of anxiety to their Governments and to us, but there are indications that the larger tropical areas for which we are responsible are recovering. Much, however, remains to be done before the trade of the Colonies can be said to be in a satisfactory position, and it is to trade within the Empire that we must look to regain at least part of the ground that has been lost during recent years. Proposals will be placed before the Economic Conference with the object of increasing inter-Imperial trade with our tropical possessions and of fostering their development. But action by Governments alone, however beneficial if rightly directed, is not in itself sufficient and needs to be aided and reinforced by private capital and private enterprise; and this all-important aspect of the question is being explored by an expert Committee under the Chairmanship of Lord Ronaldshay, the late Governor of Bengal.

---

*See pp. 34-39 of Cmd. 1474.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 37a

BRITISH EMPIRE EXHIBITION

It may not be thought inappropriate if I refer in passing to the British Empire Exhibition, with which I am associated in an unofficial capacity as Chairman of its Council. In common with the Dominion Governments the Colonial Governments are taking a considerable share in promoting the success of the Exhibition, and my anticipations will be disappointed if the Exhibition does not achieve the results expected of it and if it does not open the eyes of the world to the tremendous material resources contained within the ambit of the British Empire. I am looking forward to meeting members of the Conference at Wembley next Saturday, when they will be enabled to see for themselves the scale and scope of this great enterprise.

EXTENT OF COLONIAL EMPIRE

With this brief preface I now propose to touch upon certain aspects of the progress which has taken place in the political and industrial life of the Colonies since last their affairs were under review at a meeting of the Governments of the Empire. The British Colonial Empire, with its two million square miles and a population of fifty millions, distributed in every quarter of the globe, presents a panorama of ever-varying interest and romance; and I must emphasize what was said by my predecessor two years ago that it is impossible in the time at our disposal to attempt to do justice to this theme.

WEST INDIES

I will turn first to the oldest group of British Colonies—the West Indies.

The visit to the West Indies and British Guiana in 1922 of the former Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State (Mr. Edward Wood), who was accompanied by Mr. Ormsby-Gore, gave an impetus to the movement in progress there, as in other parts of the Empire, for constitutional development. At the same time it enabled the Secretary of State to deal with West Indian problems with the aid of the sure knowledge which comes from personal touch with the representatives of every shade of opinion on the spot. I feel confident that I carry the members of this Conference with me when I say that the written and cabled word is no substitute for direct personal contact. It is the fixed policy of the Colonial Office to follow the precedent so successfully established and to take every opportunity of repeating in other parts of the Colonial Empire similar official visits. I have already invited Mr. Ormsby-Gore to pay a visit to the British West African Colonies this forthcoming winter, and I hope that he will be leaving in the middle of December.

As a result of Mr. Wood's visit constitutional reforms are in the course of being carried out in Jamaica, Trinidad, Grenada, St. Vincent, St. Lucia and Dominica.

The economic position of the West Indian Colonies is far from satisfactory. It has been necessary for several Colonial Governments to come to the assistance of their staple industries in order to enable them to tide over a period of grave depression. Both the sugar and the cocoa industries have experienced great difficulties, and the oil industry of Trinidad, from which so much was hoped, has not hitherto come up to the expectations that were formed in regard to it.

TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WITH WEST INDIES

Telegraphic communication between and with the West Indies has given rise to dissatisfaction for some time past, both in those Colonies and, I believe, in Canada. The question was discussed at the Conference held at Ottawa in

1920, but at that time the existing contract with the West India and Panama Telegraph Company had still some years to run and no immediate solution of the problem was possible. We have recently put before the Canadian Government and the West Indian Governments concerned a scheme for an all-British cable from Turks Islands to Barbados, with subsidiary connections by cable and Wireless Telegraphy to the other Colonies. This scheme, which is based on the continued co-operation of the Government of the Dominion and of the Colonial Governments with His Majesty's Government, has now been accepted in principle by all the contributory Governments, and I hope that it will be carried out during the coming year.

This scheme will afford an opportunity for an even wider measure of inter-Imperial co-operation than the existing arrangement for joint contributions to the West India and Panama Cable Company's subsidy. The proposed cable is to be laid and maintained by, or on behalf of, all the Governments concerned, and as it is impossible for them to undertake directly an enterprise of this nature we propose, if the Dominion Governments represented on the Board see no objection, to ask the Pacific Cable Board to undertake the management of the cables and wireless stations which will be maintained under the scheme. We do not, of course, suggest that the Board should undertake any financial responsibility in the matter. All we ask is that they will extend to this new all-British route the skilled management and control which has been so successful in maintaining the all-British route across the Pacific. If our proposals are accepted, as I sincerely trust they will be, this new development of the activities of the Pacific Cable Board will form an interesting example of a Board, constituted for one inter-Imperial purpose, being subsequently employed by another kindred inter-Imperial purpose and will show in practice how co-operation between British administrations once started in any sphere tends inevitably to grow. We could ask for no happier augury of the outcome of the first Economic Conference.

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Another Imperial development which emanates from the West Indies is the recent change in the scope and title of what was formerly known as the West Indian Agricultural College. At a meeting held at the Colonial Office this summer under my Chairmanship it was unanimously agreed that the scope of the College should be Empire-wide, but it was felt that the prospect of obtaining the necessary funds would be gravely impaired if the College retained a title suggesting that it was merely a local institution. It was, therefore, recommended that the title should be changed to the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture, and our aim is that it should provide for the needs of all tropical dependencies by becoming the chief centre of agricultural research and staff training.

BRITISH GUIANA

British Guiana in particular presents a special problem. Our only Colony on the mainland of South America is rich in mineral and forest resources. In area it is as large as Great Britain, but it has a population of only 300,000. It is to be hoped that immigration, without which the Colony cannot be developed may be resumed.

WEST AND EAST AFRICA

I now turn to Africa. The British West and East African colonies both in area and population provide our greatest opportunity and the widest scope for sustained development. In those large tropical territories the improvement of communications and the advancement of education are the foundation of moral

and material progress. New railway construction is now steadily proceeding in Nigeria, Gold Coast and Kenya, while important harbour works are being carried out at Takoradi in West Africa (Gold Coast) and at Kilindini in East Africa (Kenya). It is also hoped that the last link in the connection by railway of Lake Nyssa with the coast at Beira will soon be undertaken.

KENYA AND UGANDA

In Kenya political questions have recently overshadowed all others. It has been no easy task to provide an equitable adjustment of the several interests concerned in the political future of the Colony, but, after very careful consideration, the British Government has taken certain decisions which have been made public and which I need not here repeat. I sincerely trust that the settlement which we have made will enable all its inhabitants do devote their utmost energy to the development of the great resources of the territory in which they live.

In the administration of Kenya, as in other African Colonies and Protectorates, we regard ourselves as exercising a trust on behalf of the African population. Whatever measures we take must be considered in their relation to that paramount duty. We propose to continue the general policy of moral, economic and intellectual development of the African. Within the limits of their finances the East African Governments will continue, side by side with the great work of the Missions, to do all that is possible for the advancement of the natives. Considerable progress has already been made, and the Uganda Railway Administration is now paying special attention to the training of natives for mechanical work on the railways. It is confidently anticipated that in time mechanical work of this kind and the ordinary clerical work of Government will be carried out by Africans.

TANGANYIKA TERRITORY

In East Africa we administer, under a mandate issued by the League of Nations last year, a territory larger than any Colony, that of Tanganyika. The country's prosperity depends mainly upon agriculture and it has suffered from the general trade depression, besides having much lee-way to make up owing to the wreckage caused by the War. Progress is, however, being made, though revival is necessarily slow. Revenue is steadily increasing, and the relations between the native population and the Government are excellent. It has been found possible to make a considerable reduction in the military garrison. The system of administration which has been adopted is to support and supervise, with the least possible interference, the established native authority. It is recognised that, except to a very limited extent, the country is not suitable for European settlement, and this has been recently affirmed by the adoption of a Land Law modelled closely on one which has stood the test of time in the Northern Provinces of Nigeria. "Compulsory servitude," which is the same thing as slavery, has been abolished without any of the social disturbance that was dreaded in some quarters, and, I may add, without expense. This is a step which our German predecessors had never ventured to take. We are now able to spend more money on native education—though not so much as I would wish—and also on agriculture, thanks to the liberal assistance afforded by the Empire Cotton Growing Corporation, who regard the Territory as a promising field for development.

RHODESIA

In Rhodesia important constitutional changes are now taking place.

As explained by Mr. Churchill, the position when the last Conference was held in 1921 was that a delegation from Southern Rhodesia was due to arrive

shortly in this country to discuss the terms of the future constitution. As a result of this visit, draft Letters Patent providing for the constitution of responsible Government were prepared with a view to submission to the electors in Southern Rhodesia. Subsequently discussions were also held in South Africa between the Union Government and representatives from Southern Rhodesia regarding the alternative policy of entry into the Union.

Following on these discussions, a referendum was held in October of last year on the question whether the territory favoured entry into the Union or the grant of responsible government. The referendum having resulted in a vote in favour of the latter alternative, the Constitution has accordingly now been completed and came into force this week on the 1st October. Difficult questions which had arisen with regard to the unalienated lands and the rights of the British South Africa Company on the termination of their administration have now been satisfactorily settled by means of agreements which have been arrived at with the Company and the Elected Members of the present Legislative Council of Southern Rhodesia. The settlement with the Company involves a substantial contribution from Imperial funds in addition to the amount for which the new Administration will make itself responsible. The settlement should be of material assistance to the new Government in the discharge of its responsible task. Under the new Constitution certain powers with regard to native administration are reserved to the High Commissioner for South Africa, but in other respects the people of Southern Rhodesia will have a full control of their Government and administration. In Northern Rhodesia, under the agreement made with the British South Africa Company, the British Government will relieve the Company of the administration on the 31st March, 1924, so that on that date the whole of the administrative side of the Company's great work in Rhodesia will come to an end.

CEYLON

I turn now to the East.

In Ceylon the new Constitution granted in 1920, under which the unofficial element in the legislature is given a majority, has justified the hopes of its advocates and has worked successfully for three years, although some further modifications of the Constitution are now under consideration. Ceylon's tea and copra trade is flourishing, and there has recently been a substantial improvement in the position of the rubber industry as a result of the measures for the restriction of output undertaken jointly by the rubber-growing Colonies.

MALAYA

I am glad to report that the economic depression in Malaya, especially in the two main exports of tin and rubber, would seem to be passing.

The revenue has improved, and the financial stringency, which was especially severe in the case of the Federated Malay States, is to some extent relieved. A large loan of £10,000,000, of which £9,000,000 have already been issued on the London market, has enabled the administration to be carried on and important public works to be proceeded with. The loan has been entirely applied to Federated Malay States purposes, but in order that it might be a trustee security it was found necessary that it should be issued by the Colony of the Straits Settlements, which has re-lent it to the Federated Malay States.

The Colony itself has come through a severe period of adversity without having to borrow for its own purposes.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 37a

HONG KONG

The disturbed condition of the neighbouring Chinese province of Kwang Tung and of China generally has naturally had a bad effect on the trade of Hong Kong as a distributing centre for South China, but in spite of this the trade returns for last year would have shown a considerable increase on those of the previous year had it not been for a very serious strike of Chinese labourers which paralysed the port for several weeks in the spring of 1922. A large scheme is under contemplation at present for an extensive reclamation undertaking designed to increase the facilities of what is already, from the point of view of tonnage entered and cleared, the biggest port in the world.

Of all parts of the Empire, Hong Kong has probably come through the recent acute period of trade depression with the least loss and suffering. This is due to the fact that, as the entrepôt of South China, she profits from every branch of the huge and varied export trade of China, as well as from its European imports. It is also true that political unrest in China has diverted much wealth and capital to the neighbouring British Colony, in which the merchants and well-to-do classes of Chinese have implicit confidence.

FIJI

Fiji has suffered from the loss of the Australian market for its principal export products, namely, sugar and fruit. But thanks to New Zealand, which now takes the bulk of the sugar crop, these islands, which are of great importance to our Imperial position in the Pacific, have passed the worst. I have recently learned with interest that there is an expectation of important new developments in trade and shipping communications between Canada and Fiji which cannot but be of mutual benefit to both. The demand for labour in Fiji exceeds the present supply, but the impetus of the new Canadian trade may attract both capital and labour to the South Pacific group.

FALKLAND ISLANDS AND ANTARCTIC

It may interest the Conference to know that the late Captain Scott's Antarctic ship, the "Discovery," has been purchased on behalf of the Government of the Falkland Islands for employment mainly in research into whaling in the Dependencies of the Colony, which include South Georgia, the South Shetlands and Graham Land, the South Orkneys, and the South Sandwich Islands.

In these Dependencies the Empire possesses a whaling field which in recent years has been more productive than all the rest of the world combined.

Existing scientific knowledge of the numbers and habits of the whale is inadequate; and we are anxious to devise a system of control of the industry which will prevent the practical extermination which has taken place in other whaling areas. The expedition will also afford opportunities for adding to scientific knowledge in many other directions.

Evidence that the investigations are also of interest to the Dominions is afforded by the opinion expressed by the Government of the Union of South Africa that the efforts which are contemplated in regard to the study of whaling off South Africa will gain immensely from the operations of the "Discovery."

MIDDLE EAST

This concludes what I have to say to-day about the Colonies and Protectorates, but my survey would be incomplete without some special reference to developments in the Middle East. The supervision of this area, which includes Iraq and Palestine, was assumed by the Colonial Office in the spring of 1921.

In the statement made to the Conference by Mr. Churchill in 1921, a general outline was given of the Middle Eastern policy of the late Government, which was directed towards reducing expenditure both in Iraq and Palestine. This policy has been steadily pursued both by the late Government and the present Government, and the result is that the total expenditure this year on these two countries falling on the British Exchequer is estimated at £8,548,000 as against the actual expenditure of £26,695,364 for the year 1921-22.

IRAQ

To take Iraq first: On the 23rd June, 1921, the day after Mr. Churchill made his statement, the Emir Feisal, third son of the King of the Hejaz, arrived at Basrah as a candidate for the throne of Iraq. He was well received by the people, and on the 11th July the Council of State passed a unanimous resolution declaring him King of the country, provided that his Government should be a constitutional, representative and democratic Government, limited by law. Sir Percy Cox, who was then High Commissioner, took steps to obtain a confirmation of this resolution by means of a referendum, of which the results were known on the 19th August. In an electorate of about 1,000,000 the votes for King Feisal represented a proportion of 96 per cent, and he was accordingly recognized as King of Iraq by His Majesty's Government. The next step was to place our relations with him on a proper footing. Our position as mandatory was regulated by the terms of the draft mandate (though that document had not then, and has not yet, been formally approved by the League of Nations); but it was felt that a stage had been reached, with the establishment of constitutional monarchy in Iraq, when some more appropriate instrument was required as between ourselves and the mandated State. Accordingly a communication was made in November, 1921, to the Council of the League of Nations, informing them that the British Government had been led by political developments in Iraq to the conclusion that their obligations vis-à-vis the League could be most effectively discharged if the principles on which they rested were embodied in a Treaty to be concluded between His Britannic Majesty and the King of Iraq. This Treaty would serve merely to regulate the relations between the mandatory and the Iraq Government, and was not intended as a substitute for the Mandate, which would remain the operative document defining the obligations incurred by His Majesty's Government towards the League of Nations. Negotiations with King Feisal were opened at the same time. After somewhat lengthy discussions a Treaty of Alliance was eventually signed on the 10th October, 1922. You will note the date which was just before Mr. Lloyd George's Government went out of office. The Treaty provided for the conclusion of a number of subsidiary Agreements in which the precise degree of obligation undertaken by His Majesty's Government was to be defined. It was originally to remain in force for twenty years, but the present Government, after a most careful review of the whole question of policy in Iraq, arrived at the conclusion that this period was too long. On the 30th April, 1923, a Protocol was signed at Baghdad, providing that the Treaty should terminate upon Iraq becoming a member of the League of Nations, and in any case not later than four years from the ratification of peace between Great Britain and Turkey. It was further stipulated that nothing should prevent a fresh agreement being concluded with a view to regulating the subsequent relations between the High Contracting Parties, and that negotiations for that object should be entered into between them before the expiration of the above period.

The present position is that the elections for the Constituent Assembly in Iraq, whose approval is necessary before the Treaty and Protocol are rati-

fied, commenced on the 12th July. The electoral procedure is a cumbrous one, with an elaborate machinery of primary and secondary elections based upon the Turkish system. It is not expected that the Assembly will be in session much before the end of the year. It is hoped that before its first meeting the various subsidiary Agreements now under negotiation with the Iraq Government will have been provisionally concluded.

FUTURE OF MOSUL VILAYET

There is one important point with regard to which the future of Iraq is still unsettled. You may remember that, during the first Lausanne Conference, an acute controversy arose over the future of the Mosul Vilayet. The Vilayet has been administered as part of Iraq since the end of the war. On economic and racial grounds the case for its inclusion in the Iraq State is exceedingly strong.

Nevertheless, the Turks, though their arguments were entirely refuted by Lord Curzon, held tenaciously to their claim that the Vilayet should be restored to Turkey. It was finally agreed that a decision on the boundary question should be held over for the moment; that a period of nine months should be fixed (as from the date of the ratification of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey) during which the frontier between Turkey and Iraq was to be laid down by "friendly arrangement" between the British and Turkish Governments; and that, failing such agreement within the period specified, the matter should be referred to the Council of the League of Nations. This arrangement was embodied in Article 3 of the Treaty as eventually signed at Lausanne on the 24th July last. We hope to start negotiations with the Turks at a very early date.

GENERAL SITUATION

Although this question is still outstanding, it may, I think, be claimed that the policy initiated by the late Government and adopted with the modifications explained above by the present Government, has on the whole succeeded beyond expectation. Relations between the British representative at Baghdad and the Arab Government are good. Our hope is that, within the maximum period of four years, we shall have discharged in full our obligations to the Iraq State. We also hope that we shall have established such strong ties of friendship with the Government and people of the country that they will be glad to make fresh arrangements with us, at the termination of the mandatory period, in which our special position, as the Power mainly instrumental in achieving Arab liberation, will be freely recognized. That is our confident hope. If it is realized, Iraq may yet constitute a stable factor in the East. I do not wish, however, to take too sanguine a view of the present situation. There are many difficulties still before us. The Iraq Constituent Assembly has still to be elected. It is impossible to predict with any certainty what will be its general attitude and complexion. Its first task will be to ratify the Treaty concluded by King Feisal and the subsidiary Agreements which I have already mentioned: also to enact the Organic Law which the Mandatory is required under the terms of the draft Mandate to frame for submission to the Council of the League of Nations. Until these stages have passed it is difficult to speak with full confidence.

TRIBUTE TO SIR PERCY COX

I should not like to close this part of my statement without paying a tribute to Sir Percy Cox, who recently retired from the High Commissionership for Iraq. He possessed a knowledge and experience of Middle Eastern

affairs that can only be described as unique. They were built up on a quarter of a century's arduous and successful work in the Persian Gulf region, where he acquired an influence that can never have been surpassed. We have been very fortunate in having been able to count on the assistance of this distinguished public servant in dealing with our Middle Eastern difficulties. He was succeeded last month by Sir Henry Dobbs, an Indian civil servant with a distinguished record, who had served previously in Iraq.

PALESTINE

With regard to Palestine there is one direction in which the situation has greatly improved since Mr. Churchill spoke in June 1921. The garrison has been largely reduced and the cost correspondingly diminished. The actual charge to the British Exchequer in respect of Palestine was £2,024,000 in 1922-23. The estimate for 1923-24 is £1,500,000, while we have undertaken to reduce the figure to £1,000,000 in 1924-25. The figure of £1,500,000 is, of course, included in the amount which I mentioned above as the total estimated expenditure in Iraq and Palestine for this year. Beyond 1924-25 we have not given any explicit undertaking, but we hope that the progressive reduction of expenditure will go steadily on until the figure has been reduced to very small dimensions indeed. But our success in this direction must depend on the economic development of the country, which in its turn depends upon political stability. I wish I could report to you that there has been a substantial improvement in the local political situation during the last two years. In one sense it would be true. Since the Jaffa outbreak in the early part of 1921, which Mr. Churchill mentioned in his speech, there has been no serious disturbance of the public peace. We have now got a very efficient gendarmerie in Palestine which could be trusted to deal promptly with any emergency that might arise. But political unrest is by no means a thing of the past. A solution of the Jew-Arab controversy has still to be found. Perhaps I may be allowed very briefly to sketch the events of the last two years.

ZIONIST POLICY

You are aware that our policy in Palestine is based upon the Balfour Declaration of November 1917, by which we undertook to promote the establishment of a National Home for the Jews, subject to the condition that the civil and religious rights of the rest of the population were not to be prejudiced. We have been doing our best to honour both parts of that declaration. Our High Commissioner, Sir Herbert Samuel, has displayed not only administrative abilities of the highest order, but also the strictest impartiality in dealing with the conflicting interests of the inhabitants of Palestine. A Jew himself, he has never been accused of showing undue favour to the Jews. On the contrary, his high sense of justice is recognized and applauded in every quarter.

Nevertheless, opposition to the so-called Zionist policy has continued. It came to a head in May 1921, when the Jaffa outbreak took place. In the following June the late Government published a definition of what was meant by the "National Home," with a view to allaying Arab apprehensions. The Arab spokesmen were not satisfied and decided to send a Delegation to London to place their case before the Government. The Delegation stayed in London for nearly a year, but in spite of much discussion it was not found possible to come to terms with them. What did happen was that a fresh statement of policy was issued in June 1922 which made important advances towards meeting the Arab views. The statement was officially accepted by the Zionists, but not by the Arab Delegation, who returned to Palestine after its publication. The new

policy included the establishment of a Legislative Council on a partially elected basis. The elections for this Council were fixed for the early part of this year. Owing to Arab abstentions, an insufficient number of secondary electors were returned and the project of setting up a Legislative Council had to be suspended. The Arab politicians have, in fact, adopted an attitude of non-co-operation with the Government. They have received a good deal of encouragement from various quarters, both in England and elsewhere. We shall, of course, continue to carry out our obligations. There can be no doubt whatever on that point. But the present unrest is undoubtedly doing harm, and we should be glad to see it brought to an end without delay. The matter is engaging our active attention.

TRANSJORDANIA

Perhaps I ought to add a word about Trans-Jordan. To this region, though it is covered by our Mandate for Palestine, the Zionist policy does not apply. We have there an administration under an Arab ruler, assisted by a British adviser. The ruler is the Emir Abdullah, a brother of King Feisal of Iraq and a son of the King of the Hejaz. On the whole the experiment has worked well, though the position is not altogether free from anxiety.

CONCLUSION

That is all that I wish to lay before the Conference this morning. I shall be very glad to supply further information on any point connected with the Colonies and Protectorates or with the Middle East in which any member of the Conference may be interested, and I need not say that we shall welcome any advice or counsel which may be forthcoming from any of the Delegates in the handling of the large and complex responsibilities which devolve upon the Colonial Office.

APPENDIX III

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS AS REGARDS THE TURKISH TREATY AND THE REPARATIONS PROBLEM, OCTOBER 5, 1923

I

TURKISH TREATY

LORD CURZON: Two years ago, when I spoke here about the position in Anatolia, where the Turkish and Greek armies were ranged opposite to each other, hostilities between them had just recommenced. The fighting began with a preliminary success, but ended in an early check, to the Greeks.

My object throughout, for I acted as representative of His Majesty's Government in the many Allied conversations and Conferences that took place, was to bring these ill-judged and ill-fated hostilities to a close. They could do no good to either party. They were desolating one of the fairest regions in Asia. The Greeks were unlikely to win, and, even if they did win, had neither the men nor the resources to maintain an advanced position in Asia Minor. The Turks would probably triumph in the long run, but only at a heavy cost.

Throughout 1921 and 1922 therefore my time was largely consumed at Conferences in London and Paris in the attempt to bring about Allied inter-

vention, and to persuade both parties to place their case in our hands. I was a firm believer in united action, *i.e.*, in Allied action. His Majesty's Government at no stage had a policy as distinct from the Allies, and to this policy we loyally and unswervingly adhered. But my task was not rendered easier by the notorious Agreement concluded in October 1921 between a French agent and the Angora Turks, known as the Franklin-Bouillon Agreement, which undoubtedly led the Turks to think that the French Government was unreservedly on their side, and which greatly encouraged their pretensions. All our efforts to bring about negotiations, or mediation, or an armistice, failed. Finally, the Turkish Army, imbued with a revived national ardour, well led, and taking advantage of the increasing weakness and demoralisation of the Greeks, made a sustained advance and practically drove the Hellenic forces out of Asia Minor.

This was followed by dramatic events. There was a revolution in Greece which resulted in the enforced abdication of King Constantine. The victorious Turkish army, elated by its success, conscious of Allied disunion, and resolved to push forward even at the cost of a war with Great Britain, practically destroyed Smyrna and advanced towards the Straits, then held by Allied forces. The French withdrew their troops to the European shore, being resolved in no circumstances to become involved in hostilities with the Turks. Great Britain alone saved the situation and prevented the invasion of Europe by rushing a powerful force, military, naval and air, to the Dardanelles and to Constantinople. But it was by a hair's breadth only that the renewal of war was avoided. Presently I found myself again in Paris, engaged once more in the attempt to build up Allied unity and to obtain even at the eleventh hour a pacific solution. The Mudania Armistice followed in October 1922, and the stage for the peace negotiations was set.

Just, however, as the Greek defeat had cost Constantine his throne, so the victory of Angora cost the Sultan his Kaliphate. He was deposed by Angora and fled to Malta, and his successor, appointed by the Grand National Assembly was permitted only to enjoy a purely religious authority.

On the 20th November, the first Lausanne Conference began, and there I met the representatives of France, Italy, Japan, Roumania, Jugoslavia and Greece. Thither came the Turks, with whom we were to negotiate the Treaty and the Bulgarians and others when their interests were involved. Thither the Americans sent observers. There, for the purpose of discussing the future status of the Straits, in which they were vitally interested, Russian representatives also were admitted. There we sat for eleven weary weeks, engaged in daily, and often in nightly, negotiations. At the end of that time we were on the brink of concluding a Treaty—indeed, the pen and ink were ready and the draft was lying on the table ready for signature, when at the last moment difficulties about the financial, economic and capitulatory clauses of the draft Treaty arose—feature in which the French and Italian, but particularly the former, were more actively concerned than ourselves, but in respect of which I stood unflinchingly by my colleagues—and the Turks, calculating, in view of the many concessions that had been made to meet them, that they had only to hold out to obtain even more, declined to sign. I had no doubt myself that in the long run, after some more palavering and after extracting some further concessions from the fatigue and war-weariness of the Allies, they would come to terms, and this view I expressed confidently on my return to England in February of the present year.

The discussions were resumed at Lausanne in April, and lasted for another three months, our chief representative on this occasion being Sir Horace Rumbold, the British High Commissioner at Constantinople. There were many anxious moments then as before, and the process of haggling was continued

with pertinacity and at a length that recalled the palmiest days of Oriental diplomacy in the past. Finally, a Treaty was signed on the 24th July last, which has since been ratified both by Turkey and Greece, and only awaits ratification at the hands of the Great Powers as soon as their Parliaments have reassembled. Since then, it having been decided by the terms of the Agreement that the Allied forces, which have remained in occupation of Constantinople ever since the war, should evacuate within a period of six weeks—which period terminated two days ago—the British troops ably commanded by Sir Charles Harington, who has shown the most conspicuous tact and self-restraint in very trying circumstances, have withdrawn. Our Turkish entanglement is now at an end, and it rests with the Turkish Government, having re-entered into possession of their capital, to demonstrate what use they can make of their recovered position.

I have seen the Treaty thus concluded severely criticised, as a rule by those whose motives in making the attack are not free from suspicion. Undoubtedly the Treaty is not such a Treaty as coul have been concluded in 1919, had the Allied Powers at Paris devoted to the Turkish problem one-fiftieth part of the attention that they bestowed—I might almost say squandered—upon problems and peoples of vastly inferior importance. It is not such a Treaty as was concluded and signed, though not subsequently ratified, at Sèvres in August, 1920. It is not such a Treaty as might have been signed at Lausanne had the Powers at all points maintained the united front which they displayed on some. But I should like to explain how and why it was that it was the best Treaty that could be obtained in the circumstances.

In the first place, I would remind the Conference that when I went out to Lausanne in November last it was not generally believed that a Treaty could be concluded at all. Such was the temper of the Turks, elated by their overwhelming defeat of the Greeks, profoundly suspicious of Allied and notably of British intentions, and convinced that their arms were unconquerable, that the majority of my colleagues here condoled with my mission and expected very soon to see me back again. Secondly, the principal problems, whether of the Straits or the Islands, or the frontiers, or the capitulations or finance, seemed almost insoluble, unless the Allies were prepared to dictate their terms at the point of the bayonet.

Such had been the case with all the previous post-war Treaties. These had in each case been drawn up by the victorious Powers, sitting, so to speak, on the seat of judgment, in the absence of the culprit, and imposing what penalty or what settlement they chose. Only when the terms had been drawn up was the beaten enemy admitted to be told his sentence and to make the conventional protest of the doomed man.

Such indeed was the environment in which the original Treaty of Sèvres was drawn up and signed, though never ratified by the Turkish representatives. Far otherwise was it at Lausanne. There the Turks sat at the table on a footing of equality with all the other Powers. Every article of the Treaty had to be debated and explained to them. Agreement had to be achieved, not by brandishing the big stick, but by discussion, persuasion and compromise. The Turks knew very well that the Allies had no stomach for further fighting. The Allies were never certain how far the genuine desire of the leading Turks for peace would control the unruly Nationalist and Extremist elements, who had a quite exaggerated estimate of their strength.

What then did the Treaty achieve? Territorially it lopped off from the Turkish State the whole of Syria, of Palestine, and of what is now called Iraq. Turkey ceased to have any hold or power over Arabia. Her possessions were confined to the Anatolian plains and highlands from which the Ottoman Turks originally came, and to the narrow European territories of her former Empire.

up to the confines of Bulgaria on the one hand and Greece on the other. She recovered Eastern Thrace and two or three of the Islands, but beyond the River Maritza, except for the tiny enclave of Karagach, she was not permitted to go.

But I draw special attention to the arrangement about the Freedom of the Straits, that great international safeguard, for which thousands of brave British and Dominion soldiers fought and died. When I went out to Lausanne, I doubt if any one thought that we would secure more than the freedom of commercial passage. I came away with an arrangement by which free access from the Ægean to the Black Sea, for foreign warships and aircraft, as well as merchant ships, subject to a reasonable limitation of numbers, was guaranteed to the States of the world. The Black Sea ceased *ipso facto* to be a Russian preserve. Demilitarized and unfortified zones were created on both sides of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus. Turkey was given an international guarantee for the safety of her capital and the territories around the Straits, and was allowed to maintain a garrison at Constantinople. Who can doubt that this was a solution eminently favourable to those British Imperial interests which I was sent to Lausanne to guard?

In the course of the discussion about the Straits, to which Russia had been admitted -though at that time she indignantly refused to sign the Convention — I was fiercely criticized by advanced organs at home for alienating the Power whose asquiescence in any future *règlement* of the Straits was essential, and was charged with sowing the seeds of future war. My concluding remarks at Lausanne, when the Powers, with the single exception of Russia, had signified their adhesion to the Straits Convention, were as follows:—

> "M. Chicherin has announced to us that Russia will have no voice and take no part in this Convention. The responsibility for that rests on the Russian Government, and even if it be their present decision I hope the time may come, perhaps not in the distant future, when, on reconsidering the matter, they may find it in their own, as well as in the public, interest, to give the signature which they refuse to-day."

Those words were prophetic. Five months later the Russians, quietly and without saying much about it, affixed their name to the very Straits Convention which they had repudiated and denounced, and which is now therefore a part of the accepted law of Europe. But I have never received a word of apology or vindication from the critics who were so certain six months ago of my sanguinary and sinister intentions.

In the course of the discussions at Lausanne, remembering all that my countrymen and fellow-subjects throughout the Empire had suffered at Gallipoli, I insisted upon the handing over, the proper maintenance and the safeguarding of the sacred soil on the Gallipoli Peninsula, which had been stained with their blood, and where their bodies lay. When the Turks realized that I would break up the Conference sooner than cede this point they gave way.

We laboured hard at Lausanne to secure for the minorities, particularly the Greek and Armenian minorities in the future Turkish State, a protection even in excess of that guaranteed to them by the minority clauses of the European Treaties which we adopted and confirmed in ours. I cannot say that in this I was successful. The records will show the nature of the fight that I put up for these unhappy peoples. But the Turks, in their passion for a self-sufficing and self-centred national existence, were resolved upon purging their State of all alien elements—a policy which, in my view, was grossly mistaken, which has been attended by incidents of great cruelty and hardship, and which, as time passes, they will often have occasion to repent. I did, however, obtain this much, that Turkey undertook to apply for membership of the League of

Nations after the ratification of Peace; and at the hands of that tribunal the afflicted minorities will receive such protection as it may be in the power of Europe to afford.

A troublesome question arose about the future possession of the Mosul Vilayet on the northern border of the Iraq State. To that province the Turks put forward what I conceived to be quite untenable claims, which I was called upon vigorously to contest. The dispute ended in an agreement to refer the matter to amicable discussion between Turkey and ourselves during the period of nine months after the evacuation of Turkish territory by the Allied forces. If we cannot come to an agreement, the matter will then go to the League of Nations.

The financial and economic clauses of the Treaty, which concerned France much more than ourselves, ended in considerable concessions to Turkish pertinacity, as did those parts of the Treaty which related to the conditions under which foreigners will in future reside and trade in Turkey. I do not pretend to be satisfied with those conditions. But in my view the chief sufferers will not be the foreign communities so much as the Turks themselves, who will soon learn from experience the extent to which even an emancipated Turkish State is dependent upon the resources and assistance of the foreigner. At Lausanne Turkey was consumed with jealousy for her own sovereignty, which none of us had any desire to impugn; and when the alternative was presented, as it frequently was, of ceding a point which though important was not vital, or of breaking up the Conference and reverting to a state of war, diplomacy was, I think, rightly reluctant to adopt the latter alternative.

Perhaps from the British point of view the most satisfactory result of the protracted discussion and the final agreement was the resumption of friendly relations between ourselves and a people with whom we had many connections in the past, and who went to war with us, not we with them. A second result which I do not think will be disputed by a single foreign Delegation at Lausanne has been that the Power which emerged from the proceedings with the largest access of prestige in Turkey was our own. This prestige, coupled with the strong financial position of Great Britain, should enable this country to play such part in the financial and economic reconstruction of Turkey as the stability of the future Turkish Government may justify and our own interests demand.

If then we survey the whole field, I think that the final restoration of peace in the Near East, where our troops have now been engaged for exactly nine weary and costly years, the Freedom of the Straits, the liberation of the entire block of Arab countries, the enhanced prestige of Great Britain in Turkey, together with the appeasement in all Moslem countries which is already following the reconciliation between Turkey and ourselves, are results sufficient to justify our labours at Lausanne, and to silence the not always disinterested and frequently ungenerous critics who have derided our handling of a problem which they were powerless to compose themselves. But I repeat that the destiny of Turkey lies with Turkey herself far more than with anyone else. The future which she has planned for herself, whether she become a Republic or not, whether she rules from Angora or Constantinople, will be mainly of her own creation. A very heavy task in the disbandment of her forces, the reorganization of her civil service, the husbanding of her economic resources, the resuscitation of her industrial and commercial life, lies before her. I think that she will experience great disillusionment and many disappointments, and that some of the fruits which she claims to have garnered will turn out to be Dead Sea apples in her mouth. But in making what will be a great experiment she starts with a complete absence of resentment on our part and with the sincere expression of our goodwill

II.

REPARATIONS PROBLEM

I proceed to deal with the Franco-German, or as I should prefer to call it the European, problem; for it is one that concerns not two or three States alone, but the whole of those Powers that were engaged in the war, and to whom reparations were allotted, and not least among them the British Empire. His Majesty's Government have consistently held the view that the final settlement could only be achieved by common action and common consent, and that the dispute is not merely a military or political conflict between contiguous States.

I cannot in the small space of time available to me narrate in detail all that has happened since we last met at this table in June 1921. At that date the German Government had just yielded to an Allied ultimatum which covered a schedule of payments for the discharge of the reparation debt, as well as undertakings by the German Government for the early execution of the military disarmament and other clauses of the Treaty. The Reparation Commission, who had under the Treaty been charged with the task of fixing the reparation debt, had estimated it at £6,600 millions—a total which has since in some quarters assumed an almost sacrosanct character, but which in reality bore no relation to what Germany could pay, but was arrived at by lumping together the demands of the various claimant Powers. This total, which is well known to be a quite impossible sum, and which no sane person has ever expected that Germany would be able to pay in full, can only be altered by the consent of all the Powers. For a time in 1921, the ultimatum having been accepted by Germany, and the policy of Dr. Wirth's Government being the fulfilment of the Treaty, payments were regularly made. But the situation in Germany was unstable; the mark began the first downward movement of its finally catastrophic descent; German industry and high finance were stubborn and hostile; assassination found its first victim in Erzberger—to be followed at a later date by Rathenau. Before the end of the year Germany made her first application for a reduction of the payments due in 1922. This request was discussed at Cannes in January, 1922, and certain concessions were made; more were then asked for, involving the grant to Germany of a more complete Moratorium for the rest of 1922 and for the whole of 1923, 1924.

This was the situation when the Allied Premiers met in London in August, 1922, to consider the request. M. Poincaré declared that if there was to be a further Moratorium he must have productive pledges, *i.e.*, the yield of certain taxes and industrial undertakings, as well as the forests and mines in the Rhineland and the Ruhr. These proposals were declared to be financially and economically unsound by the majority of the expert Committee who advised Mr. Lloyd George in the matter; and no decision was arrived at.

In the course of the autumn Dr. Wirth's difficulties increased; in November he resigned; and with his disappearance the policy of fulfilment, which had been his watchword, receded into the background. He was followed by Dr. Cuno.

At the end of the year, when a decision by the Powers was necessary, since the next payments were due, a further Conference of Allied Prime Ministers was held in London, followed a little later by a renewal of the meeting in Paris. By this time Mr. Lloyd George had ceased to be Prime Minister, and Mr. Bonar Law had taken his place. Now it was that the Ruhr, which had been in the background of all the French plans and proposals for two years, emerged into prominence as the sole French specific—the Ruhr to be occupied, preferably by the Allies, if not, then by France and such of her Allies as would go in with her, France's object in the move being to obtain immediate payment of the £1,300 millions which she claimed, plus whatever sum might be required

to pay off her debts to Great Britain and the United States. Put in another way, France would agree to no reduction of the total of the German reparation debt save as a set-off against the cancellation of her war debts to Great Britain and America.

The British view on the other hand was that Germany was incapable of making large immediate payments; that the occupation of the Ruhr was not the right way in which to secure such payment; that by reducing the capacity of Germany to pay, owing to the loss of her most important industrial and economic centre, payment would be indefinitely postponed, and further exasperation and probably at a later date internal disruption in Germany would be produced and that grave economic loss would thus be entailed, not merely on the occupying Powers, but on Europe, viewed as an economic unit, in general Mr. Bonar Law therefore declined to join in the occupation, and proposed an alternative plan for the reduction of the total debt to £2,500 millions with an accompanying issue of bonds, a moratorium for a short period of years and the institution of a drastic control over German finance. Further, if this proposal were accepted, he made the offer, startling though unrecognized in its generosity, to cancel the French and Italian war debts to us *in toto*.

The French refused, and on the 11th January the Franco-Belgo-Italian occupation of the Ruhr began. It cannot, I think, be denied that the sanguine expectations with which it was entered upon have been largely falsified by the results. An extensive and prolonged military occupation was far from being contemplated, and, indeed, as soon as it appeared inevitable, the Italians retired from the scene. The sustained obstinacy and fury of passive resistance were not foreseen. The anticipated payments, whether in deliveries of coal and coke or in reparation payments, were presently shewn to be not forthcoming. Meanwhile, as the net yield of the Franco-Belgian occupation became increasingly disappointing, so the treatment of the inhabitants by the Franco-Belgian authorities became increasingly severe. Thus there grew up a sort of deadlock, or, if the metaphor be varied, a condition of embittered stalemate between the rival forces. The Germans took the view that the occupation was in direct violation of the Treaty. They refused all voluntary reparation payments to France and Belgium, and they threw every possible obstacle in the way of the industrial exploitation of the region. The work of the military disarmament of Germany, provided for by the Peace Treaty, also came to a standstill.

In the meantime Mr. Bonar Law, in a generous anxiety not to frustrate by British action the success of a policy in the practical application of which he disbelieved, but the principle underlying which, viz., the desire and necessity to obtain reparations, was equally accepted by ourselves, while wishing the French good fortune in their undertaking, took up an attitude of strict neutrality. That attitude we have maintained throughout the summer, retaining our army of occupation in the area the custody of which had been assigned to us by the Treaty, endeavouring to hold the scales between the rival parties, and hoping to bring them to an ultimate arrangement. The fact that we learned from our Law Officers, after Mr. Bonar Law's return from Paris, that the occupation was not, in their opinion, justified by the terms of the Treaty, thus confirming the wisdom of the British attitude, was never concealed by us from our Allies. On the other hand, public use was not made of it until M. Poincaré himself raised the legal issue by basing his case on the alleged illegality of the German action in resisting the occupation.

I am not here to apportion praise or blame between the various parties to the conflict. Our sentimental sympathy would always have been and was with our old and trusted Ally. We had not the smallest desire to take the side of Germany, or to let the Germans down easily, or to deprive France of her just due. On the other hand, we also had to consider our due, and, viewing the

matter not through the glasses of sentiment, but from a severely practical angle we regarded with increasing anxiety the prosecution of a policy that seemed to us to be productive of no good results, and to be leading on to disaster and ruin.

In the course of the spring the German Government under Dr. Cuno made a number of rather ill-advised suggestions for compromise, which I need not summarize because they were in each case inadequate and stillborn. I did not think that their diplomacy in this respect was wise; and in my various interviews with the German Ambassador I never failed to impress upon him this point of view and to urge that the duty of his Government was three-fold: (1) to pay their just debts, (2) to agree to the fixation of the payments by competent authority, (3) to offer specific and adequate guarantees. Simultaneously His Majesty's Government never wavered in the assertion of their broad and general loyalty to the Entente, and more than once indicated to the French Government that, if security rather than, or in addition to, reparations was in their mind, we should at any time be willing to discuss it. The first definite move, again halting and ill-conceived, was made by Germany in the opening days of May last. It was promptly turned down with scorn by France and Belgium and met with no approval from us. Then in response to a suggestion made by His Majesty's Government their second offer of the 7th June came. This was more substantial; for the German Government now offered to accept the decision of an impartial international body as to the amount and methods of payment, they proposed certain specific guarantees, and they asked for a Conference to work out a definite scheme. Here at least seemed to His Majesty's Government to be both the chance of progress and the material for a reply. Prolonged conversations with our French and Belgian Allies left their views and intentions veiled in some obscurity; and accordingly we decided, with their knowledge, to draw up the draft of a joint reply, with a view to securing the inestimable advantage of concerted action.

By this time the question of passive resistance, which had been continued with unabated intensity and had baffled all the French expectations, had assumed the first place in the outlook of our Allies, and M. Poincaré more than once laid down with uncompromising clearness that not until it was abandoned would he enter into discussions as to the future. For our part we continued to give advice in a similar sense to the German Government; and in the draft reply which we submitted, its abandonment, entailing the gradual resumption of civil administration and the progressive evacuation of the Ruhr, was put in the forefront of our scheme. In our explanatory letter to the Allies we further made concrete proposals, viz., for the examination by a body of impartial experts, acting in conjunction with, and if necessary under the orders of, the Reparations Commission, of the question of German capacity and modes of payment, a similar examination into the question of the proposed guarantees, and the summoning of an Inter-Allied Conference to bring about a general financial settlement. I do not think, therefore, that it can be said of His Majesty's Government that they were either backward in initiative or barren of suggestion; and certainly our proposals appeared to us to be characterized both by impartiality and goodwill. They were unfortunate, however, in receiving an unfavourable reply from France, and a not much more favourable reply from Belgium. These replies have been published to the world, and I need not recapitulate their nature. It is enough to say that not until passive resistance was definitely abandoned by Germany would our Allies agree to make any move; our proposal for an expert enquiry was rejected; the French and Belgian claims for repayment were restated in unqualified form. I confess that my colleagues and I were greatly disappointed at the result of our sincere but thankless intervention. Once more we stated our case in the British Note of the 11th August, a note revised with meticulous care, first by the Cabinet and

then by the Prime Minister and myself, and once again we offered as the price of a settlement to cancel the whole of our claims except for the sum of £710 millions sterling to meet our debt to the United States Government. Moreover, if we could get a portion of the sum from German reparations, our demands upon our Allies would be proportionately reduced. The replies of the French and Belgian Governments have been published. They indicated not the faintest advance from the position already taken up. Our capacity for useful intervention was manifestly exhausted.

Meanwhile, as time passed, it became apparent that the German Government could not, even if they desired, persist in the policy of passive resistance; and at length, only a week ago, Herr Stresemann, who had succeeded Dr. Cuno a few weeks earlier, decided to surrender. I think myself that this surrender should have been made three months ago and was unwisely and foolishly postponed. But I have always been told, and I suspect that it is the truth, that no German Government could at that time have survived which made the surrender. Whether Herr Stresemann, who had the courage and the wisdom to take this step, will survive is uncertain as I speak these words.

And now what is the point to which we have come? We do not grudge our Allies the victory—if victory it be. On the contrary we welcome, just as we have for long ourselves advised, it. But are we any nearer to settlement? Will the reparation payments begin to flow in? What is the new form of civil administration or organization that is to be applied to the Ruhr? These are questions which it is vital to put, and vital also to answer.

One of the results at any rate that we anticipated has already been brought about For we see the beginnings of that internal disruption which we have all along feared, but which we have been consistently told to regard as a bogey. And let it be remembered that disruption is not merely an ominous political symptom. It has a portentous economic significance, for it may mean the ultimate disappearance of the debtor himself.

What therefore should be the next step? I have made no concealment of our view in my conversations with the French Ambassador, and it has the approval of the Prime Minister, who recently did so much by his visit to Paris to recreate a friendly atmosphere after the rather heated discharge of the rival guns. We have repeatedly been assured by the French Government that, as soon as passive resistance definitely ceased, the time for discussion between the Allies would have come. So far as I can gather, the German Government are sincere in their intentions, and have taken the steps required of them. What may be the attitude of the local population in the Ruhr I cannot say. But if the French contention be valid that it is only in obedience to orders from Berlin that they have hitherto resisted, there should be no difficulty about their conduct now. I would merely remark that, while passive resistance has, as we hoped and desired, been replaced by passive assistance, it may be too much to expect it to be followed all in a flash by enthusiastic co-operation.

The French Government know therefore that we await and expect the next proposals from them. The contingency of the cessation of passive resistance must have long been anticipated at the Quai d'Orsay, and the consequent measures doubtless exist in outline if not in detail. We shall be quite ready to receive and to discuss them in a friendly spirit. Our position at Cologne in the occupied area gives us a right to be consulted in any local arrangements that may be proposed, and that position we have no intention to abandon. Our reparation claim, willing as we have been to pare it down in the interests of settlement, renders it impossible that any such settlement could be reached without our co-operation. Our stake in the economic recovery of Europe, which affects us as closely, and in some respects more so, than the immediate neighbour of Germany, makes us long for an issue. We have already shown our willingness, by unexampled concessions, to contribute to it.

APPENDIX IV

SPEECHES REGARDING THE WORK OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, OCTOBER 11, 1923

STATEMENT BY LORD ROBERT CECIL, K.C., M.P., LORD PRIVY SEAL AND BRITISH REPRESENTATIVE ON THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Lord Robert Cecil: Prime Minister, I am in a little physical difficulty and I hope the Conference will pardon me if my statement appears to be inadequate to the importance of the cause.

I propose, with your permission, to deal a little generally with the topic of the League and not merely to confine myself to the particular issue of the Italo-Greek crisis, unless the Conference desires me to do so.

I do not propose to give you, or attempt to give you, a review of the history of the League proceedings during the last few years, because, in the first place, I have so recently joined the Government that I should not be qualified to do it from the inside point of view, and from every other point of view everybody is equally qualified with myself, because the whole of the proceedings, as you know, are always published either immediately or at a very short interval after they have taken place.

AIMS AND POSITION OF LEAGUE

What I would like to try to do, if I may, is to make some kind of estimate of the present position of the League and what place it ought to occupy, and does occupy, in the foreign policy of the Empire. And it is necessary, though I should have hoped it would not have been, to begin by one or two elementary observations, owing to certain criticisms from highly-placed quarters, which have been passed on the recent proceedings of the League. It seems necessary to emphasize once again that the League is not a super-State and it is not there to give laws to the world it is not an organization which either legislates for or administers other countries, nor is it a mere debating society, a collection of more or less eminent persons who go there to indulge in futile oratory. I think it may be defined as an international organization, to consider and discuss and agree upon international action and the settlement of international difficulties and disputes. Its method is not, therefore, the method of coercive government; it is a method of consent and its executive instrument is not force, but public opinion. Now, I am sorry to insist upon what to many of my hearers must be very elementary observations, and I only do so, because, in connection with this crisis, there was published a very strong criticism of the League and the action of the British representatives, on the authority of an ex-Prime Minister, which seemed to me to show that there was a considerable misapprehension, even in the highest quarters, of what the League really strives to do.

OBJECT OF LEAGUE IS TO PROMOTE AGREEMENT AMONG NATIONS

The League's business is not to impose a settlement, even when a controversy is brought before it; it is to promote agreement. The recent controversy was brought before the League under Article 15, as I shall show in a minute, and its business was to get a settlement of the controversy and an agreement of

the parties, and, if they did not agree, there was no power under the Covenant, nor would it have been at all in accordance with the general principles of the League, for the League to attempt to enforce what the Council of the League might think was the proper settlement. As everybody, I imagine, in this room knows quite well, there is only one occasion in which, under the Covenant, force is to be used, *i.e.*, under Article 16, and the object of that is not to enforce any particular settlement or a particular action, but to prevent nations from fighting, especially until an opportunity has been given for discussion, and consideration, and agreement. It is rather important, I think, that that should be realized in considering the actions of the League, and not least its action in connection with this Italian-Greek crisis. There ought to be no doubt about it, because the very words of the Preamble describe its objects—"To promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security." Those are the two objects of the League and they are to be accomplished, as I say, by inducing the nations to agree and act together, and not by any attempt by a group of nations, or by the majority of the League, to enforce on any particular nation any particular line of conduct which is approved.

RESULTS ALREADY ACHIEVED

Now I would like—I will be as brief as I can—just to ask whether this conception, because it is necessary to ask it in view of what has recently been said in some quarters, whether this conception has, in fact, worked out successfully. Let me just take the first object of the Preamble—international co-operation. I do not think the severest criticism of the League will deny it has achieved an immense amount of co-operation of the most valuable kind and of the most multifarious description. I only propose to mention—I do not propose to discuss or describe—what it has done, but, when we come to consider the enormous number of different ways in which it has acted in order to promote international co-operation, I think there will be no doubt in the minds of anybody in this room that it has carried out this part of its duty with very remarkable success. Take its humanitarian exertions: the repatriation of hundreds of thousands of prisoners of war, the relief of hundreds of thousands of refugees, the organization of a defence against the epidemics from the east of Europe, achieved with very little expense and with absolutely complete success. Or you may take its social activities: the great efforts and the successful efforts it has made to strengthen the fight against opium, to extirpate the horrible traffic in women and children, which is one of the disgraces of our civilization, the assisting and protection of native races, and a very large part of its work which is subsidiary to the League, but in a sense part of it, its work in the International Labour Organization.

Or you may take its economic work: the great amount of work it has already done to facilitate the increase of transit between nations, or the smaller matters that it has had something to do with, to relieve the hindrance caused by passport regulations, or the work which it has done quite lately, the other day, to induce the nations to agree on a convention for the enforcement of commercial arbitration, a thing of immense importance to the commercial interest all over the world. Or you may take its financial work: I need not go back on the old Brussels Conference of 1920, although I still think that was a very considerable effort towards the financial re-establishment of the world and that it deserved better practical success than it actually achieved. Or you may take the better known and more striking success, the very, very considerable steps that have been taken towards the financial rehabilitation of Austria, very remarkable work—I have not time to deal with it in any detail, but the Conference is well aware of the very remarkable success that has been

achieved in that direction. So remarkable is it that Hungary is asking us to help her in the same kind of way, though, I hope, with less contingent financial liability than in the case of Austria; and unhappy Greece, which has been saddled with a terrible financial problem of providing for a million refugees, i.e., a quarter of her whole population, in addition to the existing population, is asking us to facilitate the raising of a loan for that purpose, and the establishment of a scheme for the settlement of these refugees on a sound economic basis. Or you may take its administrative work: the administration of Danzig, the administration of the Saar, the various administrative duties which have been thrust upon it, or have been offered to it, by the Lausanne Treaty; or you may take the number of other cases—I will not weary the Conference by enumerating any more—from what is called the intellectual co-operative work, which I think perhaps has more the sympathy of our continental neighbours than ourselves, down to a conference for fixing the movable feasts of the Church so as to have a fixed holiday instead of a movable one. All this work has been done, and, I think, with very great and remarkable success, and, considering the immense amount of advantage that has accrued to the populations of the world, with wonderfully little expense. I do not believe it could have been done in any other way than by the existence of the League.

IMPROVEMENT ON PREVIOUS PROCEDURE

If anybody who is familiar with these things consider what, under the old system of a diplomatic correspondence and special conferences perhaps called of a partial kind, which have no machinery to carry them out between their summoning, if you consider that, I think you will agree that the work could not have been done except by the League. The truth is that the League really has done splendid work in all these respects, and, as Lord Curzon said the other day, the League has exercised a wholesome and conciliatory influence in world politics. I do not think it is right to under-estimate the immense importance of all these kinds of activities in that conciliatory influence on the larger political questions which have to be transacted between nations. But, of course, all that is comparatively a minor matter.

STATUS OF LEAGUE IN INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

The second object of the League is the object of achieving international peace and security, and anyone may well say how can you make any claim for the League if you consider the condition of Europe now, after the League has been in existence for three or four years.

I feel the force of the observation. But, in the first place, I must point out that the League is only what the Governments composing it choose to make it. It for them to say. As I have already explained, it is not a super-State, it has no coercive jurisdiction—it is for the Governments to say how much or how little work they entrust to the League. The League was not asked to deal with the Russo-Polish war; it was not asked to deal with the Turco-Greek war; it was not asked to deal with the question of Reparations; and it is those three big questions more than anything else that have been responsible for the unrest which still prevails in Europe. No doubt, of course, it may be said that if it had been asked to deal with those three big questions it would have failed. All one can say is that may be so, but the organizations which have attempted to deal with them have not been pre-eminently successful. On the other hand, as everyone knows, in the number of smaller questions which have been entrusted to the League, the League has succeeded in allaying the difficulties and disputes which have come before it.

I need not recount the circumstances of those disputes, the question of the Aaland Islands, the question of Upper Silesia, the question of Albania and Serbia, which was a very dangerous question, and even the question of Vilna, which many people regard as one of the least successful matters; but war between Lithuania and Poland was prevented. I think no one can deny that the work of the League did not meet with complete success, yet it did do this, it prevented any further fighting on the subject, and stopped the fighting which was already in progress.

ITALIAN-GREEK CRISIS

But all these are smaller questions, and that is why the recent Italian-Greek question is of such enormous importance in the history of the League. It was the first occasion on which an International Dispute of the first order—one which might easily have led to serious wars in Europe—it was the first big question that had come before the League, and it is for that reason that I hope the Conference will allow me just to go through the dates and events, and point out exactly what the League did do and what the League did not do.

The murder of General Tellini took place on the 27th August, and the Italian ultimatum was issued on the 29th August. The Greek reply was the next day—the 30th August—and after acceding to the first three or four demands and explaining that the Greek Government was not able to accede to the other three, without abdicating its sovereignty—that is, undertaking to hang somebody, to allow another Power to take its place in trying the criminals, and, above all, to undertake to pay 50,000,000 lire whatever happened—those three demands the Greeks refused and concluded by saying that, if their reply was not deemed to be satisfactory, they were quite willing to submit the whole matter to the League; and they bound themselves beforehand to accept whatever the League should suggest. On the same day, the 30th, came the Ambassadors' note making their demands, for the Ambassadors were parties to the dispute; they made their demands on the same day, and also on the same day the Italian Government intimated that they would not accept the League. It is rather important that that should be emphasized, because it has been suggested that it was something which the League did which induced the Italian Government to reject it, but, as a matter of fact, they rejected it before the League had done anything. On the 31st the Ambassadors' note was delivered and the bombardment and occupation of Corfu took place, and articles appeared in the Italian press hostile to the League.

APPEAL TO LEAGUE BY GOVERNMENT OF GREECE AND ACTION TAKEN BY COUNCIL

On the 1st September the Greek request for a hearing before the Council of the League was received in Geneva. The Council of the League happened to be in session already. It immediately met on the morning of the 1st in private; it is an illusion of some of our critics to suppose that the first meetings of the Council to deal with this matter were in public. It met in private, and the Greek representative, M. Politis, presented his request for the consideration and decision of the League. He read Articles 12 and 15, or at any rate the material parts of them, and under those articles anyone can see who refers to them that there is an absolute right given to any member of the League to submit to the League any dispute likely to lead to a rupture with any other member of the League, and it becomes the absolute duty of the Council to take that matter into consideration and endeavour to effect a settlement of it, and, if a settlement is impossible, then to hear and report upon the issue submitted to it, the parties agreeing that they will not resort to war until the dispute has been heard and reported upon.

In making his speech M. Politis disclaimed any desire that Article 16 should be applied. Article 16, as everyone knows, is an article which provides for economic pressure and blockade, and ultimately stronger measures, in case a country resorts to war without having submitted its dispute to the League. In other words, M. Politis did not claim that there had been a resort to war I think he was right in the attitude he took. There had been an act which might have been treated as an act of war, but in fact was not treated as an act of war by the party against whom it was directed; and, therefore, there was technically no resort to war, and M. Politis very explicitly said that he had no desire that Article 16 should be applied. I do not know whether the Conference may have noticed a letter by Sir Frederick Pollock in yesterday's "Times" in which that distinguished jurist explains his view that there was no resort to war in this case.

QUESTION OF COMPETENCE OF LEAGUE

The Italian representative, Signor Salandra, said that he had no instructions, and asked for an adjournment, but incidentally called attention to the fact that, since the matter was also an offence against the Conference of Ambassadors, they were involved, and it was a question—he did not actually say that the League had no competence at that stage, but suggested that it was a matter that the Conference of Ambassadors ought to deal with. That was not accepted at that stage by the Greek representatives, and on behalf of the British Government I said we had no doubt at all as to the competence of the League, and I, while deploring deeply the murder—which I, of course, did—said on behalf of the British Government that we felt there was no question as to the duty of the League to entertain the request of the Greek Government under the clear terms of Article 15. I think the Conference would agree that the position was clear. There was a dispute, if ever a dispute existed which could be described as likely to lead to a rupture; it was a dispute of that nature; it was a dispute which at any moment might have caused war between the two countries. Any hasty action on the part of the Greek Commander might have precipitated the two countries into a war, and it may be with other countries as well; that was clearly a dispute likely to lead to a rupture. It was submitted to the Council of the League by one of its members expressly asking them to act under Article 15, and, as anyone who will read that article will agree, there was no option or discretion in the matter; the Council were bound to act, and they did act. The line which I took on behalf of the British Government was very warmly supported by the Swedish representative, M. Branting, and there was no question on the part of any member of the Council as to what the duty of the Council was, apart from the Italian representative. However, we adjourned till the 4th in order to allow the Italian representative to receive his instructions, merely passing a resolution to the effect that we hoped nothing would be done on either side to aggravate the situation.

FEELING IN ASSEMBLY

The Assembly met on the 3rd, and it had become quite evident that there was a very strong and a unanimous feeling in the Assembly on the point. It is perhaps worth while to remind the Conference of the position of the Assembly, I mean of the delegates. The larger Powers are usually represented by persons of more or less importance, commonly ex-Ministers or persons of note of that kind; the smaller Powers are not infrequently—I think I might say almost usually—represented by their Foreign Minister or somebody of equal authority in their country: Dr. Benes on behalf of Czecho-slovakia, M. Nincic on behalf of Serbia, M. Kalfoff on behalf of Bulgaria and Dr. Nansen on behalf of Nor-

way, and so on; consequently a very large proportion of them speak directly for their Governments, and those who are not actually Ministers are usually people of such importance that anything they say carries the opinions of their countries with them. It was, therefore, of great importance that there was a really strong vehement feeling that the League must act and must do its duty, and a strong feeling also, of course, that the occupation and bombardment of Corfu was, in the circumstances, not a defensible proceeding.

FURTHER PROCEEDINGS OF COUNCIL

There had been delivered on the 2nd, and this is an important fact in the situation, the reply of the Greeks to the note from the Ambassadors' Conference and in that reply they expressed their willingness to accept whatever the Ambassadors put upon them. On the same day I received, and was intensely grateful to the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary for them, the instructions from the British Government authorizing me to take whatever action I thought right to support the Covenant. The next day the Greek Note to the Ambassadors was received of course, and we received—I need not go into the detail of it—we received information of the rather vehement and formal rejection of all competence of the League on behalf of the Italian Government. That was the 2nd September. When we met on the 4th September, in the first public meeting of the Council, the Italian instructions had not arrived. They had sent somebody, one of their members, to Rome to get personal instructions and all that we did on that occasion was to hear a further proposal from the Greek Government offering the deposit of 50 million lire in a Swiss bank to await whatever damages might be awarded against them. Then came the meeting of the 5th September and then we had a communication for the first time from the Ambassadors' Conference telling us what was going on in Paris. We had a speech from the Italian representative denying the competence of the League in a very much more moderate form, it must be said, than the language which had been used outside the Council of the League, and it was on that occasion that we had read to us the relevant articles of the Covenant in French and English pointing out what the duties of the Council were and that we could not infringe those duties without breaking the Covenant and incidentally breaking the Treaties of Peace of which the Covenant was part. It became clear at this stage, both from what Signor Salandra said to us in the Council and from information conveyed to us from outside, that the Italians were now prepared—they had not said so up till then—to accept the Conference of Ambassadors, not only as the proper authority for dealing with the offence to the Ambassadors, but as determining what ought to be done between Greece and Italy, and therefore on that date we were for the first time in the presence of an agreement by the two parties of the dispute to accept the decision of a Tribunal, of a body, outside the League. We had a meeting, a certain number of members of the Council met and considered what reply we ought to send to the Ambassadors and we felt that our business under the Covenant was to do everything we could to promote a settlement, and since the two parties had agreed to accept the decision of the Conference of Ambassadors our object henceforward was to do everything we could to facilitate the task of the Ambassadors, and to make their decision as nearly in accordance with public opinion of the world as expressed at Geneva as we could. We therefore drew up the proposed terms of settlement apart from the question of the evacuation of Corfu, and these were proposed by the Spanish member of the Council at the meeting of the Council on the 6th. We were unable to send those proposals as agreed recommendations to the Council of Ambassadors, and it was in order to get over that difficulty that at my suggestion we decided to send the whole of the minutes of our proceedings to the Ambassadors who.

as we knew, were going to meet the next day to deal with the matter, and the minutes included not only the actual proposals which were, in fact, the proposals which were afterwards adopted practically without alteration or very small alterations by the Conference of Ambassadors, but also included certain very important declarations by other members besides the British member of the Council as to the competence of the League. The Belgian member, for instance, M. Hymans, made a very strong declaration as to the clear competence of the League. That was assented to by the Swedish member and by the Uruguayan member, and also by the Spanish representative. It was, of course, quite well known that that represented the strong feeling, as I have already said, of all these nations there assembled at Geneva, and I happen to know, as a matter of fact, that that feeling was conveyed by a great number of different nations both at Paris and at Rome to the Governments of France and Italy. I have not myself the least doubt that that strong feeling had a considerable effect upon the readiness with which the Conference of Ambassadors on the 7th September adopted the suggestions which the Council of the League had put forward as to the settlement of the question apart from the evacuation of Corfu. The Conference of Ambassadors did adopt them. They were accepted by Greece and Italy and then took place a rather awkward pause. We were informed that the Conference of Ambassadors were going to deal with the question of Corfu also. As I have said only too often, the business of the League was to promote an agreement and a settlement, and as long as there was any prospect of a settlement being reached it was not the duty of the Council of the League to intervene. They therefore held their hand altogether during the next few days awaiting the decision of the Conference of Ambassadors as to what was going to happen in Corfu. They, of course, reserved to themselves the right to take the matter up again if no settlement was reached or if a settlement was reached so plainly in defiance of all public law that they could not allow it to pass. As a matter of fact, on the 13th the settlement was reached, and the note which was sent by the Conference of Ambassadors to Greece was not unsatisfactory. It said that it adhered to the terms, of course, of the 7th September, the first note, and that having received from the Italian Ambassador a statement that Italy would in any case evacuate Corfu on the 27th September, which, I may parenthetically observe, was two days before the end of the Assembly, having received that assurance it went on to say that, if the Ambassadors were satisfied that Greece had not carried out with due care its obligations to search for and punish the criminals, then they reserved to themselves the right to impose further penalties on Greece including the payment of the whole 50 million lire without any reference to the International Court. That was the note of the 13th September. On that we were not called upon to make any observations, because both Greece and the Italians accepted the note and so far as the League was concerned the matter was at an end.

PART PLAYED BY LEAGUE IN SETTLEMENT

A settlement had been effected; we had done the best we could to effect that settlement and I am convinced that the concentration of public opinion at Geneva was one of the great factors in promoting what was, after all, a very rapid pacific solution of an exceedingly difficult question. On the 17th September there was a meeting of the Council at which we took note of this settlement and I took the opportunity of explaining very much what I have explained to the Conference here, what seemed to us the duty of the League in cases of this kind. On the 18th the Italian representative made a further statement as to his objection to the competence of the League. It was, I think one may say without impertinence, more moderate than the previous declarations had been and thereupon it was

agreed that we should take means to clear up definitely and for ever, as far as one could, all these legal questions that had been raised, the question of competence and the question of the right to seize territory in order to enforce demands—I will deal with that in a moment—and also the question of the responsibility for political crimes committed on the territory of a State. I need not trouble the Conference with the details of the negotiations that then took place. A number of meetings of the Council took place and we called in our legal advisers. They drew up five questions which raised these matters and they were accepted, together with a declaration to which I shall refer in a moment, by the Italian Government.

DISCUSSION IN ASSEMBLY

On the 28th, and this is the last date I shall have to trouble the Conference with, there was a meeting of the whole Assembly when, for the first time, the Assembly thought it was right for them to discuss and express an opinion upon these events. It was begun by the President of the Council, Viscount Ishii, reading the resolutions to which the Council had come. He was followed by M. Branting, who expressed certain criticisms, particularly that the matter had not been referred directly to the International Court of Justice. I made some observations.

Then occurred a really rather remarkable demonstration. Eight or ten representatives from all parts of the world, from all four quarters of the globe, one after the other, expressed in the strongest way their conviction that the League was competent to deal with the matter and their regret at some of the incidents that had occurred.

SUMMARY OF POSITION

May I just try and summarize what seems to me to have been the result? Greece submitted the questions under Articles 12 and 15, and, as I have explained, the Council was bound to entertain them and did entertain them. There was no resort to war and hence, as the Greeks very truly said, Article 16 did not apply. On the other hand a very serious question was raised as to the action of the Italian Government in occupying territory in order to enforce a demand against Greece.

PRECEDENTS FOR ITALIAN ACTION

That is not as clear a matter as perhaps some of us would wish. Undoubtedly before the Covenant it had been quite common for countries of all kinds to exercise coercion of that kind. Sir Frederick Pollock called attention to the proceedings in Crete, but there are stronger cases still. There is a case in the early sixties where the British Government did almost exactly the same as the Italian Government. A British subject was murdered in Japan by one of the feudal clans. This was before the marvellous changes in Japan. The British Government demanded £25,000 as compensation to the relatives of the murdered man and £100,000 as compensation to the British Government and apologies and the arrest of the criminals. When the criminals were not arrested as quickly as they thought they ought to be arrested the British fleet bombarded a place called Kagoshima and burned it to the ground. I mention this because it is right that we should realize that, apart from the Covenant, there was nothing unusual, whatever we may think of it as a proper international proceeding, there was nothing unusual in what the Italians did at Corfu. On the other hand it has raised the question of whether that Covenant permits any such action to be taken by one member of the League against another without at any rate resorting to every means of discussion and debate in order to settle the dispute before such measures are taken.

DEFENCE OF COUNCIL'S ACTION

Shortly, I venture to say that the Council did exactly what it ought to have done under the Covenant. Its business was to promote a settlement. If that settlement could not be promoted by diplomacy or by arbitration, which are mentioned under Article 13, its business was to hear and report upon the dispute itself. It carried out that duty of promoting a settlement absolutely, and its suggestions, as I venture to think, for the settlement were of great value and were in themselves quite sound. But once the parties had agreed on settling it in another way than by the report of the Council, it was not only the right, but it was the duty of the Council to do everything they could to facilitate the settlement by those means.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSION OF JURISTS

There remain then these two questions which I have referred to, the question of the legality of the occupation of Corfu, which I have already dealt with, and the question of the competence of the League. They have been dealt with in this way. We, most of us, or I and several of the other members of the Council, desired that they should be referred to the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion. The Italians were opposed to that, in the case of one of the questions. They proposed that they should be referred to a Commission of Jurists. Ultimately we agreed to the Commission of Jurists and they agreed to a very strong declaration: That any dispute between members of the League likely to lead to a rupture is within the sphere of action of the League and that, if the dispute cannot be settled by diplomacy, arbitration or judicial settlement, it is the duty of the Council to deal with it under Article 15 of the Covenant. In view of that very strong declaration which seemed to me to go far to dispose of the question of competence, I did not myself think it was necessary to fight any longer for the immediate reference to the International Court of Justice. The matter will go to this Committee of Jurists and they will report to the next meeting of the Council on the 10th December. If the Council still feel that the matter is in any doubt they will be able to put any further questions they like to the International Court.

EFFECT OF ITALIAN ACTION ON POSITION OF LEAGUE

It seems to me, therefore, that as far as the formal position of the League is concerned, it is unhurt. An attack was made on its competence that has been either actually withdrawn or will be dealt with finally in the near future. The question of the occupation of Corfu is also to be submitted to legal determination, and so is the question of the responsibility for a political crime committed on the territory of a State. I confess I think those provisions for dealing with these questions which have been raised in this dispute in a strictly legal way form a very valuable precedent. I do not recall any instance of an international dispute of this nature raising very difficult questions which has been followed by an attempt to settle those questions by strictly legal and constitutional means, and if that precedent is established and is followed it really will lay the foundation, as it seems to me, for a gradual elaboration of international law which may be of enormous value for the future peace of the world. Therefore formally the League is unhurt.

Substantially, however, I do not think one can go as far as that. There has been the challenge by a great Power of the competence of the League. It is quite true that that has been met immediately by a very remarkable rally of all the smaller Powers to the support of the League. It showed a very strong, vigorous, vital feeling on the part of all those Powers not only in Europe, but

all over the world that the League must be supported, that it was the only guarantee of justice between the States and that the small States particularly were vitally interested in the maintenance of the authority of the League. I think that was a very valuable counterweight to the repudiation—I think we must admit it was repudiation—by a great Power of the competence of the League, at any rate for a time. I do not think that repudiation has done the League's authority as much harm as some people believe.

GENERAL ATTITUDE TOWARDS COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS REPRESENTED ON IT

Apart from the actual repudiation by a great Power, the other unfavourable symptom that struck me at Geneva was a certain want of confidence in the Council of the League by the members of the Council. They did not feel as sure of themselves as I could have wished. They did not quite know what it would be safe for them to do. That is perhaps not a matter of surprise considering the short time which the League has been in existence, but I do think, if I may say so, that it points to the necessity for these countries that believe in the League, as I hope we do, giving to the League on all possible occasions every support that they can and making it a most essential part of our foreign policy.

COMMENTS ON LEAGUE MACHINERY

On the other hand, I think we may say, those of us who believe in the League, that there were very many encouraging things about this crisis, not only the matters to which I have already alluded. I think we may say with great truth that the machinery of the League worked well, that it all worked, as we used to be told, according to plan, that the dispute when it was presented came naturally to the Council, the Council naturally considered it, there was no hitch or difficulty. I myself believe that the publicity in which the later stages of the controversy took place was all to the good. I believe it enabled public opinion to support the League, to support what I think was justice. I think that the effect of public opinion was exactly what we who believed in it thought it would be; it was so overwhelming that no country could stand against it, and that, when it became clear that the public opinion of the world was on one side, that country had to modify its policy in accordance with the opinion expressed.

SUPPORT OF BRITISH EMPIRE FOR LEAGUE

Somebody said to me the other day that the British Empire never had any foreign policy except to keep the peace. I believe that is roughly true; at any rate, true for very many decades, if not centuries, past. We have tried to keep the peace; that has been the great object of British foreign policy, working not by force, not by power, but by trying to promote friendliness amongst the nations. That has been, I believe, the broad object, sometimes more and sometimes less successfully pursued by successive British Ministries. I believe it is still the essential thing we should aim at. We now have in our hands an instrument for that purpose in the League of Nations, incomparably more effective than anything we have had before. We ought to do our utmost to strengthen the League and make it more and more the corner stone of our policy, for unless we can get rid of the war machinery, the idea of force and compulsion, I do not myself think there is any hope that we shall see a pacified and restored Europe

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

APPRECIATION OF LORD ROBERT CECIL'S STATEMENT

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not know that I have much to add by way of comment, except to express appreciation for the information we have received, particularly in relation to the Italian-Greek crisis, and the fact that Lord Robert Cecil went so carefully and fully into the different aspects of the work of the League in which we are all so interested.

EFFECT OF ITALIAN ACTION ON PUBLIC OPINION IN CANADA

In speaking of the Italian-Greek crisis and the relations of the League thereto, we cannot from a distance but feel that the extent to which public opinion was focussed on the dispute was increased a thousandfold by virtue of the fact that the League's authority to a certain extent had apparently been asserted. It gave to every country, certainly to Canada in her interest in the dispute, a feeling of immediate concern, which I think she otherwise would never have had. I believe that much the same feeling was aroused in America, though she is not a member of the League. I think there was a feeling that, after all, nations had endeavoured to set up some machinery to take the place of force, which machinery should be respected. I believe that the fact that the League was meeting at the time certainly went far in arousing world opinion and would have led to a much more vigorous action from the outside world if necessity had occasioned it. Certainly nothing could better express the views that were held in Canada generally with reference to the support which should be given to the League than the concluding remarks of Lord Robert Cecil. In every particular they would be endorsed with enthusiasm from one end of our country to the other.

GOOD EFFECTS OF LORD ROBERT CECIL'S VISIT TO CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES

May I take advantage of this occasion to express the pride and pleasure which we all felt in the visit of Lord Robert Cecil to America and the addresses given there. I believe they were distinctly helpful in interpreting the work of the League in a sympathetic manner to the people of the North American continent. I believe the speeches did much good. I do think that Lord Robert Cecil's visit was in every particular helpful to the League and to the British Empire.

I should like to mention that my colleague, Sir Lomer Gouin, was one of our representatives at the League and possibly the Conference would like him to say a word or two if he so desires.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER OF JUSTICE, CANADA

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I was at Geneva representing my country at the last meeting of the League of Nations. I followed the deliberations of the Assembly and the deliberations of the Council. I must say that I felt proud of the rôle played by Lord Robert Cecil both before the Assembly and before the Council.

CANADIAN AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 10 OF THE COVENANT

I must take this opportunity to thank Lord Robert Cecil for the great help he gave Canada in connection with the proposition that we laid before the Assembly with regard to Article 10 of the Covenant. As you remember, in 1919, at the time that the Peace Conference was preparing the Covenant, the representative of Canada, my predecessor, the Right Hon. Mr. Doherty, opposed

Article 10, and, after the Covenant was signed and brought to our Canadian Parliament for ratification, he maintained his opposition to that Article. But, believing in the Covenant and wishing to be a party to the League of Nations, he asked our Parliament to ratify the Covenant, which was done. In 1920, at the very first meeting of the Assembly of the League, he came before the delegates and asked for the repeal of Article 10. This was referred to a Commission appointed by the Council, and the report of that Commission was to the effect that, instead of repealing Article 10, an interpretative clause should be adopted by the Assembly. That report was discussed at two Assemblies, and in 1922 our representative, the Hon. Mr. Lapointe, finding that he could not obtain the repeal of Article 10, brought up another amendment in advance of the proposition of the interpretative clause. This year I brought up the same amendment and with the help of Lord Robert Cecil and the representatives of the other Great Powers, we succeeded in having the Commission, which had been entrusted with the examination of our proposal, submit an interpretative declaration to the Assembly, which voted for it by a large majority, one State only voting against it. It is true that the Clause was not adopted, as unanimity was necessary under the rules, but . . . .

LORD ROBERT CECIL: It was only Persia who was against it.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes, and that is why I say that in effect we have obtained the interpretative declaration which we were seeking. And for this I wish to renew my thanks to Lord Robert Cecil for the assistance that he has given us. That is all I have to say.

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

INTEREST OF AUSTRALIA IN LEAGUE

Mr. BRUCE: Prime Minister, on behalf of the people of Australia, I feel I must say something in regard to this question, because I do not think there is anything at this time they are more interested in than the League of Nations. The idea of the aims and objects of the League is gradually percolating through Australia, and there is a very strong feeling growing up there that the League of Nations has at least got the germ of a hope to maintain peace in the world. I am confident that Australia would take any action it could to promote the authority of the League of Nations, and to give it every opportunity to go forward and grow in strength and become the great instrument that those who brought it into being had in mind. I think that Australia's demand for some voice in the foreign policy of the Empire is, to a very great extent, directly traceable to the League of Nations and Australia's interest in its objects.

AUSTRALIA STANDS FOR PEACE AND SUPPORT OF LEAGUE

It has been very well put by Lord Robert Cecil, to whom we are very grateful for the information he has given, that Britain's foreign policy is Peace. Australia's foreign policy would certainly be Peace; and, quite apart from any apprehensions, which I may have appeared to suggest that we had, of being involved in war without our consent, we also feel that, after the late tragic war, we have a responsibility to try to do our share in promoting peace in the world, and Australia believes that the foundation of Britain's foreign policy should certainly be to support the League of Nations and make its authority as great and world-wide as is possible. In the debate which took place in Australia with

regard to these Conferences, the view was expressed that one of the greatest tasks that lay to our hand was to see whether this Conference, representative of the whole Empire, could not really do something towards ensuring the peace of the world and solving some of the very serious problems we are faced with to-day. The people of Australia take a very strong view of this matter; and I am sure they would say, almost with a united voice, that they do believe in the League of Nations, and that all our actions ought to be directed towards trying to promote its power, its force and its authority in the world.

NEED FOR DISCRETION

There are one or two things, however, that I think I ought to say. We are enthusiastically in favour of the League, but we think that the League ought to show great discretion, and very great discretion, in the next few years, certainly in the period of its infancy. If the League tries to go too far and too fast and to achieve all the objects it has in view in too short a time, I think it will defeat its own ends.

PROGRESS ALREADY MADE AND PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE

Personally I think very great progress, considering the time the League has been in existence, has already been made, and I am quite certain that that progress will be accelerated and that we may be a little surprised at what the League can accomplish. I recognize, of course, that the League of Nations is never going to do what we hope while there are great nations outside it; but there is no reason, because certain nations to-day do not see that they can join the League, why we should think that the League should not go on and that the case is hopeless. The position will probably improve in the future, and the one think we have got to bear in mind is to keep the League in existence, keep it functioning; and whether it is this League, or a greater League that will spring up in a few years, we have to keep its idea alive. We saw very clearly that it was imperative when the tragic sufferings of the war were very close to us, which many of us rather seem to have forgotten. The League should be kept alive because, if this League goes, we have no hope of establishing anything of the sort until we have been through another world tragedy of the same character as that which our generation has seen. The next world tragedy of that character is going to be a tragedy one-hundredfold worse than the one we have experienced. So that, although Australia is enthusiastically behind the idea of the League of Nations, it does not think that the League at this stage, in its infancy, can ensure the peace of the world, but it believes that, if the League is given opportunity to grow, there is the germ here of the one thing that may ensure the great object we all have, to maintain the peace of the world.

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF NEW ZEALAND

APPRECIATION OF LORD ROBERT CECIL'S STATEMENT

Mr. MASSEY: I would just like to say by way of introduction, Prime Minister, how much I appreciate the very plain and straightforward statement that we have had this morning. I think if even part of Lord Robert Cecil's statement is published it will go a long way to clear the atmosphere which has undoubtedly been created by recent events. I wish also to say how much I sympathise with Lord Robert Cecil in what has recently taken place

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 37a

For years past he has given practically the whole of his efforts, and the whole of his energy, and the whole of his ability, to the business of the League of Nations, from the commencement right up to now. I know that he must have been disappointed with some of the criticisms, at which I am surprised myself, and with some of the misrepresentations—which are worse than criticisms—that have been given utterance to by men who ought to have known better.

PERSONAL OPINION OF VALUE OF LEAGUE

In saying that, I am bound to admit that I have never been quite an enthusiastic supporter of the League. But, with regard to what has taken place, my own opinion is that too much was expected from the League, and I think that some of the more ardent supporters of the League are themselves to blame for the feeling that has been created. The idea that was created was this, that the operations of the League would prevent war. I never thought so. I do not think for a moment that the prevention of war by the League was possible. The League was initiated to promote peace—peace by arbitration, peace by conciliation, or peace by bringing to bear public opinion. I say now that I believe a very great deal of good has been done by the League and it ought to get credit therefor.

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

APPRECIATION OF LORD ROBERT CECIL'S WORK FOR LEAGUE

General Smuts: I wish to join those of my colleagues who have already spoken in expressing very strong appreciation of the work that Lord Robert Cecil has done at Geneva. As the Representative of one of the Dominions for a number of years, and now the Representative of the British Government, I think he has rendered invaluable service, not only to the world at large, but also to the British Empire, in the stand he has made for League principles and for the position of the League. I nominated him as the South African Representative, not because he was necessary from the South African point of view or to defend South African interests, but in order to give him, as the great protagonist in this country for the League, a platform from which he might continue effectively to support that movement. He has done so in a way which I think is above praise. The moral stock of the British Empire, so far as I am informed, is very high in Geneva. I was very much struck by what one of the South African representatives told me on his return from Geneva the other day. He said the most remarkable thing at Geneva is the confidence, the faith, the reliance, which all the small peoples of the world represented there have in the British Empire and in the stand that we are making for justice, fair play, and international honesty. That is a matter of very great importance to us and I think it is very largely due to the ethical tone which Lord Robert Cecil has been able to give to the discussions there, and to the message of goodwill that he has been able to bring from this country and from the other young nations of the British Empire to the nations of the world.

RESTORATION OF AUSTRIA

Lord Robert has told us this morning in his very full statement what the League has done and the successes the League has achieved, and he has in particular referred to the successful restoration of Austria. The success of the

Austrian experiment is valuable and significant not only in itself, but because it points a way to a similar treatment to any other country that may require our help in the future. I was discussing with some financial men in the City what might be done in case Germany were to break down completely financially, and there was a consensus of opinion that the Austrian experiment had been so successful and formed so good a precedent that, if we had to take action, our treatment of Austria might serve as a very valuable precedent. And let me say this: that in the case of Austria also South Africa has been able to be helpful. We happen to have as one of our South African representatives a gentleman of Austrian origin and of very great financial ability who has been able to make a very notable, if not the main, contribution towards the rehabilitation of Austria.

SUPPORT OF BRITISH EMPIRE FOR THE LEAGUE

I would press very strongly that the British Empire, the British Government and the Governments represented here at this Conference, should use all their power in order to keep their hands clean and support the League and support the smaller Powers where their interests clash against the larger Powers. I agree thoroughly with Lord Robert when he said that the position of the League is not one of force; it does not rest on the sanction of force, but on public opinion, the moral enlightened opinion of mankind. The more we can marshal that opinion, and we can play a large part in doing so, the more we can marshal the support of public opinion and the feeling of the world on the side of the League, the better for the future of the League. The League is inevitable. The League ideal seems to be the only hope of the world, and, if in practice the League has not realized the great anticipations of those who originated it, it is because of its youth and inexperience, and because of the difficulties of the time through which we are passing, times of reaction, times of disillusion, times when it is almost impossible to keep any good cause afloat. We recognize that we are passing through an era of grave difficulty; all we can do is to keep the flag of the League flying, and not to put burdens on it which it cannot carry. In the end it must triumph; that is inevitable. There is nothing else if there is to be a reign of law and justice in this world. In the meantime, we can do our best to marshal public opinion behind it and to see that it stands for the high principles for which it was originally founded. I was very glad to hear the speech of Mr. Bruce, the Prime Minister of Australia. It shows how all the young countries of the British Empire are now falling into line in real wholehearted support of the League. To my mind there is no doubt that the League is not only a great world interest; it is a British interest too. I thoroughly endorse what Mr. Bruce has said. The more we can make the League a real living force, the less armaments we as an Empire shall require. We cannot rest merely on a military or a naval basis. Something far greater than armaments will be wanted in an Empire as great as ours, and the League seems to me to be a real, substantial, moral reinforcement of our whole position. The more we can strengthen it, the more we can make it a reality, the more secure our position will be, which is not one of military or naval ambitions, but one of peace and social progress in the world. I therefore hope that whatever we can do to strengthen the position of the League we shall do.

VALUE OF LEAGUE TO EMPIRE

Let the world know that behind the League and behind the action it has occasion to take is the whole force and weight of the British Empire. I am sure the League is adding a new bond of cohesion to the Empire. I am sure that the time is coming when the young nations of the British Empire will be pre-

pared to support any particular line of action, not merely to support Great Britain, but because the League is being flouted, because the League is being attacked, and they stand by the League. These young nations will have an added motive and an added reason for coming forward and supporting the international action of Great Britain.

WORLD'S NEED FOR LEAGUE

But it is to our interest, not only from the point of view of the British Empire, but far more still from a broad human point of view, to support the League as strongly as we can. What do we see to-day? We see a whole world lapsing into decay. Europe has been so smashed by the war that nothing seems possible to make her rally again. The break-up which began at the end of the war is continuing. We do not know what Europe will be like in ten or twenty years' time. We only see that forces are at work, far deeper and of a more fundamental character than we ever thought possible. We thought it would be possible to stabilize the position at the peace and to have a settlement of Europe which might be abiding. We have seen now that hope has been in vain Nothing now is abiding. The unsettlement of Europe continues, the break-up continues. And in those circumstances, if there is any practical force that will work in keeping the nations together in peace and protect us against an era of complete reaction and brigandage such as seems now to be setting in, if there is any such practical institution, let us exploit it to the full. We are no doubt in for a very bad time. I think this present generation will probably see human institutions put to as severe a test as they have ever been. And when we have an institution like this which, whatever the attitude of the great Powers, is undoubtedly appealing strongly to the smaller Powers, practically to all of them, I think we should marshal our forces behind it, knowing that this will be a stabilizing agency and that it will help to keep us together and keep humanity afloat through the dark seas through which we are voyaging now. Perhaps I speak too strongly, but that is my feeling. So far from the League being a sort of revolutionary agency as many have thought, something that will destroy the British Empire, something that will work unknown mischiefs in the world, I look on it as a great conservative stabilizing force working on the side of the British Empire and the ideals for which we stand. Not only from the large human motives which have impelled us, but also from the point of view of the British Empire, we have every reason to support this movement to the fullest of our power and ability, and I hope we shall continue to do that, and I trust that the next crisis, which may not be far off, will see the League emerge with greater credit and more strongly than it has come out of this last crisis.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, IRISH FREE STATE

ACCEPTANCE BY IRISH FREE STATE OF PRINCIPLES OF LEAGUE

Professor JOHN MACNEILL: I may say that the Irish Free State has arrived at nothing nearer to a definition of foreign policy than is expressed in its adhesion to the League of Nations, and I was very much gratified to hear on all sides to-day, from Lord Robert Cecil and from the representatives of other States who have spoken, the view expressed that the foreign policy in which we, as a group of nations, ought to be interested—I shall not say to

which we ought to be committed, but in which we ought to be interested—should be in harmony with the principles underlying the League of Nations. I sincerely trust that will always be so. If it is so there will never be any difficulty in our following a common course together and following it effectively. Speaking as the junior among you and representing a junior State among you, I have no hesitation in saying that, if a test of those principles arose and if the League of Nations through its properly accredited organs required a certain duty to be done, a certain amount of pressure, in whatever form desired, to be applied, I am perfectly certain that the nation for which I sit here would not be behindhand in doing that duty. I should like to emphasize the point of view that I have expressed, because, as an observer in Geneva, I did my best to estimate the feeling that was abroad, especially among the smaller nations, and I should say undoubtedly it was a feeling of dissatisfaction rather than a feeling of want of confidence, a feeling of desire that the objects of the League should be made effective, which is I think the next thing to the operative will that they should be made effective. On this question in general I did my best to express the view of the Irish Delegation in a statement that I made at the meeting of the Assembly on the 28th September and I shall not take up the time of this Conference in repeating that view now.

APPRECIATION OF LORD ROBERT CECIL'S WORK FOR LEAGUE

I should like to join with those who have spoken already in offering a testimony, a stronger testimony than my own personal testimony, when I say that, so far as I know, and I have heard of nothing to the contrary, it was the unanimous feeling of the representatives of the nations at Geneva that Lord Robert Cecil had done as much as could be done to maintain the prestige and the effectiveness of the League of Nations.

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF NEWFOUNDLAND

APPRECIATION OF LEAGUE

Mr. WARREN: I will not trespass upon the Conference except to express what I feel as a result of this discussion. Youth as a rule does not command respect and is sometimes subjected to correction, either moral or physical, which, as I know from personal experience, is sometimes quite unjustifiable. The League is a young one and I think it has borne the strain very successfully. The fact that it has borne that strain shows that although it is young still it is a hardy and strong growth, and I feel confident that when it goes forward and becomes the power, which undoubtedly it will become, it will not be subjected to such strains as have been put on it recently. By that I mean that the nations will see what the League can really do and will rather apply to it for aid than attempt to thwart it.

NEWFOUNDLAND'S CONFIDENCE IN LORD ROBERT CECIL

So far as Newfoundland is concerned we are not represented in the League of Nations, but we leave our interests, with perfect confidence, in the hands of Lord Robert Cecil.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 37a

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA, AS HEAD OF THE INDIAN DELEGATION

SUPPORT OF LEAGUE

LORD PEEL: I desire to associate myself generally, on behalf of India, with the views that have been expressed here by the representatives of the Dominions in support of the League of Nations.

OPIUM QUESTION

I think that I ought to make one or two remarks on the position of India in connection with the opium question. Some resolutions were passed at the last meeting of the Advisory Committee on Opium with reference to the traffic in opium and we have been criticized, I understand, in certain quarters because our representatives could not fully accept those resolutions and were compelled to make a reservation on behalf of India. The reservation that was made on behalf of India was to the following effect: "That the use of raw opium according to the established practice in India and its production for such use are not illegitimate under the Convention." Those who are familiar with Indian habits and customs will realize how essential it was that the representatives of India should support such a reservation.

INDIA'S POSITION AS REGARDS OPIUM TRAFFIC

As there has been some criticism of Indian action on this point I should like to say, and I will say it very briefly, how very strong the position of India is upon this subject. First of all, let me remind the Conference that the Indian Government have made very great sacrifices in the cause of the restriction of this opium traffic. They have sacrificed no less than four million sterling per year by their restriction of this traffic, a very great sacrifice indeed in the case of a country with such a large poor population and such comparatively limited resources as India possesses, but not only that, they have most loyally and faithfully and fully carried out—I was going to say to the letter—all the provisions of the Hague Conventions in connection with the subject of opium. I do not want to criticize other countries, but I could not say the same thing of many of those countries adjoining India who have a financial interest in the opium traffic. And not only that, but the Indian Government have been very careful to restrict all their exports of opium to the amount actually approved of by the Governments of the countries to whom their opium was exported. They have, in fact, only exported on indents, as you might call them, from those particular countries and I would like to add this point, that, as regards the consumption of opium, during the last three years this has become a subject which is domestic to the provinces rather than an all-India subject, because this question of the consumption of opium is now under the control of Ministers, Indian Ministers, in the provinces; in fact, it is altogether under the control of Indian Ministers except in one particular province, and that is Assam. Those Indian Ministers are responsible to Councils and those Councils consist of a substantial majority of popularly elected persons; therefore we may assume that those Ministers responsible to those Councils are fully cognizant of the interests of their own people and are fully competent, if they wish, in the interests of those people to restrict the consumption of opium. I point this out because the situation, of course, has very largely changed in this respect during the last three years and I am not sure whether some of the other representatives at the League of Nations were fully cognizant of the change that had thus taken place.

APPENDIX V

POSITION OF INDIANS IN OTHER PARTS OF THE EMPIRE

ORDER OF SPEECHES

PAGE.

OCTOBER 24, 1923

1. Secretary of State for India..... 56
2. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru 61
3. His Highness the Maharajah of Alwar..... 74

OCTOBER 29, 1923

4. Secretary of State for the Colonies..... 81
5. Prime Minister of Canada..... 83
6. Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia..... 90
7. Prime Minister of New Zealand..... 93
8. Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa..... 95
9. Minister of External Affairs, Irish Free State..... 99
10. Prime Minister of Newfoundland..... 100
11. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru..... 100

OCTOBER 31, 1923

12. Secretary of State for India..... 104
13. His Highness the Maharajah of Alwar..... 106
14. Secretary of State for the Colonies, on behalf of the Secretary of State for Home Affairs 111
15. Prime Minister of Great Britain..... 112
16. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru..... 113

Annexe (A).—Memorandum prepared in the Colonial Office as to the political status of British Indians in the Colonies, Protectorates and Mandated Territories... 114

Annexe (B).—Memorandum by the Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa..... 116

OCTOBER 24, 1923

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA, AS HEAD OF THE INDIAN DELEGATION

LORD PEEL: Prime Minister, I should like to thank you and to thank the Conference also for giving the members of the Indian Delegation the opportunity of bringing this question of the position and status of Indians in the Dominions before you. I think you will all recognize that this subject is one of very high Imperial importance, and I know that in approaching the subject I speak in a general atmosphere of goodwill.

IMPORTANCE OF PROBLEM

Now, at the outset of the observations let me say that I wish to deal with the broad outlines of the subject, because my colleague, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, has some definite suggestions to make when he follows me. I propose to deal with this subject not so much as it affects any Dominion or any Colony, but in the most general way. I want to show that if the unity and the strength of the Empire are to be maintained and preserved it is really essential and imperative that we should find a solution of this problem of the position of Indians in the Dominions

overseas. There have been, as the Conference knows, very great constitutional changes quite recently in the position of the Government of India, and these changes have brought into prominence what was possibly latent before, but is now clear, the existence of various parties with various opinions and policies. But, however much these parties may be divided in their points of view on general political subjects, on this one point there is complete unity of feeling. For instance, there is no difference as regards the strength of this feeling between the party which has been giving general support to the Government in the Assembly, and the various sections of what I may call the non-co-operative parties. When I speak of Indian opinion, I am not referring, as is often suggested, to what is described as the opinion of the *intelligentsia* only, of a definite intellectual class, but I am also stating the views of a great many who are not really necessarily concerned with politics at all. Let me pass from them for a moment. You have the opinions, we will say, of the Indian Princes, whose views will be given expression to to-day by His Highness the Maharajah of Alwar. You have other men like my other colleague, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, who, as we all know, was a member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, and who holds a very high place in Indian public affairs. Therefore, you have this singular picture, that politicians, differing widely on all other subjects, and men of differing shades of thought, are generally united on this particular subject You have staunch supporters of our rule in India combining on this subject with the extreme types of politicians. You have business men and landowners combining with men of a very different class and point of view.

FEELING IN INDIA

I certainly do not exaggerate when I say that this subject more than any other, I think, is constantly impressed upon me both officially and personally by the Government of India and by Lord Reading, the Viceroy. The Viceroy, in his private letters, is constantly explaining and pressing upon me how strongly the feeling of soreness and bitterness is growing on this subject, and how, in many ways, the task of wisely governing India is made more difficult by this intensity of feeling. Therefore, I want to place this first point before the Conference—the remarkable unanimity of feeling on the position of Indians in the Dominions; but I do not think when you come to ask the cause that it is very far to seek.

The reason why there is such unity among our fellow subjects in India is this, that they regard the disability under which their countrymen labour in other parts of the world as a brand of social inferiority. That is what cuts so deep into the consciousness of the Indian. I am not necessarily, of course, associating myself entirely with that view, because I know quite well that there are other causes contributing, that there are questions of economic difficulty, political questions with which this question must necessarily be linked. But I have no doubt whatever that, in what I am saying now, I do voice the general opinion of Indians.

This question of social status is a contributory cause in the history of many social and political movements disguised under more resounding names.

INDIA'S SERVICE TO THE EMPIRE

Well, let me say a word about this great country, feeling so strongly and unitedly on the subject. First of all, look at its contribution to the Great War No less than 1,400,000 men from India took their part in the service of the Great War. Their contribution in money was well over £200,000,000. We all remember the general enthusiasm from all parts of India, and how Princes and others less distinguished all alike took part in the struggle of the Great War.

HER NEW STATUS

And here, if I may say so, there are installed at this very table representatives of the Indian Delegation, showing that India is sitting here on equal terms with the other Dominions in the great council chamber of the Empire. And, again, at the League of Nations the representatives of India take their place with the other States represented there and are able to contribute their voice and their influence just as much as others to the deliberations of that Assembly.

HER INDUSTRIAL POSITION

Moreover, and I do not think this is always recognized, India, though it has been for centuries, for thousands of years, a great agricultural State, is now ambitious to become an industrial State; it has gone far along the road, because it has been accepted by the League of Nations as one of the eight greatest industrial States of the world.

INDIA'S NEW CONSTITUTION

Now India, as the Conference knows, has recently received a new political constitution, and that constitution, while giving the Indians far more power than they had before in the administration of India, has also given them a great outlet for the utterance of their national sentiments. Now what is the position in India itself? In India itself there is a policy of co-operation. Britons and Indians co-operate together in the Government of India; Britons and Indians sit together on juries; they meet together in business; they are fellow-directors in the great companies; they serve together on the Viceroy's Council; many of them, of course, are Ministers in the great provinces, and those Ministers command the assistance of members of the all-India Services whether British or Indian. Now, what must be the contrast in the minds of these men when they look abroad and see what their standard or status is in the States of the Empire. The members of this Conference, with their great experience of the cumulative effect of these institutions and the position which India now occupies here and in the League of Nations, will realize how much all these changes have contributed towards the growing self-consciousness and sense of dignity of India.

INDIA'S FEELING FOR THE EMPIRE

Now I want to say this, and in the most plain way that I can; if I thought, and if my colleagues thought, that this desire for equality of treatment was inspired in any sense by a desire not to be part of, or to take part in, this great Empire, neither I nor my colleagues would be pleading the cause at this table. It is, indeed, the desire and it is the ambition of Indians—I will exclude the negligible class of extremists, who can be found I suppose in any country—it is their intent and ambition to share in the splendours, the glories, and the traditions of the British Empire.

They believe, moreover, that they can bring their own contribution, of thought, culture and loyalty, to this great combine. There are those who suggest that these disabilities under which Indians labour in some parts of the Empire are of little importance, that they do not interfere with their liberty, and that the denial of the vote does not very much matter one way or the other. Now, these views are, as one knows, the common form of objections put forward, either here or in any country, to franchise extensions and franchise grants. But, though the question has importance from the purely material point of view, I should be very ill discharging my duty to this Confer-

ence if I were to represent this matter as one to be regarded merely from the practical point of view. It is very largely with the Indians a matter of national sentiment and feeling, and it is with this feeling that we have to reckon.

IMPORTANCE OF INDIA TO THE EMPIRE

Now, in all situations of Imperial activity, in matters of Imperial defence, matters of Imperial trade, Imperial communications or the development of Imperial resources, in all these India plays a most prominent part, and, as we have granted to India a large measure of representative institutions, it is quite clear that in dealing with these large matters we cannot disregard the opinions of the representative bodies which we have set up. And, supposing they were disregarded, how, after all, are you going to expect India to co-operate wholeheartedly in the great work of consolidating the Empire, and how, without this co-operation, can the Empire attain its full measure of strength? We know, too, that economic policy is very often influenced by political considerations; and I feel that both on the political and the economic side the task of governing India may be greatly increased, and that there will be, unless we settle this question, no real unity in the Empire, not merely on the material side —on which I am not laying so much stress to-day—but on what is so vastly more important, the moral side.

SCOPE OF PROBLEM

Moreover, the scope of this problem as regards many of the Dominions is not really very great. For the moment I am excluding from that general proposition South Africa, where I know a great many currents and cross-currents of opinion complicate the issue; but as regards Australia, and as regards New Zealand, where much has been done, and as regards Canada, the numbers that we have to deal with are very small -about 2,000 in Australia, in all that vast country, about 600 in New Zealand, and about 1,200 in Canada, of whom, I think, rather more than 1,100 are in the Province of British Columbia.

RESOLUTION OF 1921 CONFERENCE

I want to reaffirm what was stated at the Conference in 1921* as to the complete acceptance by the Government of India and Indian opinion of the right of the great Dominions to determine the composition of their own community. May I read the words of that resolution? They are as follows:—

> "The Conference, while reaffirming the resolution of the Imperial War Conference of 1918 that each community of the British Commonwealth should enjoy complete control of the composition of its own population by means of restriction on immigration from any of the other communities, recognizes that there is an incongruity between the position of India as an equal member of the British Empire and the existence of disabilities upon British Indians lawfully domiciled in some other parts of the Empire."

Therefore, that principle is laid down quite clearly, and consequently there need be no anxiety on the part of any of the Dominions that there is any desire on the part of Indian feeling to go back on that decision. Thus, in pressing this matter upon the generous consideration of the Dominions, I feel that, vast as are the implications of the problem, the solution of the practical question is perhaps not so difficult as it appears. Well, justice and expediency are often

---

*See page 8 of Cmd. 1474.

divided. Sometimes they approach each other, and when, as I think in this case, they combine and are merged in one another, the appeal is surely irresistible, and I am going to ask this Conference if the time has not come when these disabilities should be specifically removed.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT'S DUTY OF SAFEGUARDING INDIAN NATIONALS OVERSEAS

I want to add this point, about the interest—possibly some may think the unnecessary interest—which the Government and the Indian people take in the position of Indians in the great Dominions. Now, so long as to any extent Indians in the Dominions may be regarded as a foreign body in the great body politic of those Dominions, so long is the Government bound to take an interest in their fate and to assure themselves as to the manner in which they are treated. But once they are absorbed they cease to be a foreign body; once they are absorbed into the great corporation, as it were, of the Dominions, then the interest of the Indian Government, of course, will cease; and there is nothing that anybody connected with it, there is nothing the Secretary of State for India, dislikes more than interfering or appearing to interfere with the domestic affairs of the great Dominions. Now, I am not insensible, of course, of the grave difficulties which stand in the way. I know how very difficult it is to bring home always to local opinion that local views and opinions are not necessarily coincident with the wider interests of the Empire, and I know quite well that those who are listening to me as representative of the Dominions—whatever they may or may not have done—desire that a solution of this question should be found, and I do most earnestly plead that, when later in this Conference they take into consideration the practical measures which they may adopt for the solution of this question, they will bear in mind the intense feeling that has been aroused on this subject in India, and will bring home to their own people that in the highest interest of the Empire the aspirations of India should be respected.

DIFFICULTIES OF PROBLEM

I know that there are great difficulties. The Prime Minister, in his opening address, spoke of the contacts of civilization. There are contacts, of course, here of more than one civilization and you have peoples differing in tradition and social habits, fashioned in the course of centuries—thousands of years, I may say—fashioned by differences of national surroundings, by differences of secular and religious thought. We have to deal—and we should never forget when dealing with India that we have to deal—with ancient races full of the pride of race; we have to deal—with ancient religions full of the pride of religion. That is, of course, one of the great differences we have to remember in dealing with the position of India as compared with countries further west. There are, for instance, 70 millions of Moslems in India—70 millions in India; but in communion with them through religious ties and rites there is a vastly greater body—hundreds of millions of Moslems—stretching in a great belt from the Gulf of Malaya right across to West Africa—hundreds of millions of Moslems, who, in their hour of worship, all turn their faces to Mecca.

INDIAN CULTURE AND TRADITIONS

We have the pride of the Hindoos in their own history, in their recollections of the past; they look back to, shall we say, the Mauryan Empire, the memories of Chandra Gupta and of his famous grandson King Asoka. Their memories stretch to an even earlier time when, scarcely noticed by history, their Aryan ancestors were moving down from the North-West Frontier, the traditional path for the invasion of India, along the plains of the Five Rivers now called

the Punjab; they look back to dim far off times, to a date long before the Jutes and Angles and Saxons and Norsemen, the original elements of which our race is composed, landed on these shores; when Rome itself was a mere village, before the Roman legions garrisoned the Great Wall which used to run from sea to sea in the North of Britain; a period even before the Druids reared the gigantic monoliths of Stonehenge.

I press this subject on the Conference, and I hope, with the consent of the Prime Minister, that they will listen to Sir Tej while he deals with the subject in more detail.

STATEMENT BY SIR TEJ BAHADUR SAPRU

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru: Prime Minister, let me at once say how deeply grateful I feel to you and to His Majesty's Government, and may I thank you and His Majesty's Government and the various Prime Ministers for giving me this opportunity of a free and full discussion of the question in which India is to-day so vitally interested. I fear I may take some time, but I shall crave your indulgence for more reasons than one; the most important of those reasons is the importance of the subject. I am glad that His Majesty's Government have decided to set apart a special day for this subject. That being so, am I not entitled to draw from it the inference that His Majesty's Government do really recognize the importance of this question? When it is known in my country that His Majesty's Government recognize the importance of this subject, and that that recognition is shared by the various Dominion Prime Ministers, that fact alone will inspire them with some hope.

Before I proceed further, may I also express my deep gratitude to Lord Peel for the assistance he has given me in helping to bring this subject up before the Conference, and for the speech which he has delivered to-day, which has filled me with gratification, and which I have no doubt, when it comes to be known to my countrymen, will fill them also with gratification. He has identified himself to-day completely and unreservedly with every sentiment of our national honour. That is what I appreciate more than the moving eloquence with which he delivered his great speech this morning.

I may well produce in some quarters the impression of being a fighter. I do not object to criticism of that kind. Really and truly, I am fighting the cause of my country, and the Premiers of the various Dominions, who have in their day fought the cause of their country, will not object if I fight the cause of mine. But I do fight, let me tell you frankly, as a subject of King George, and I fight for a place in his household and I will not be content with a place in his stables.

UNANIMITY OF INDIAN FEELING ON QUESTION

Prime Minister, let me tell you that the problem of Indians overseas is of vital importance not only to India, but to the whole of the Empire. Whatever may be our position in regard to self-government, howsoever distant we may be from that cherished dream of ours, let me tell you that, so far as this question of Indians over-seas is concerned, we stand solid and united. We have our own domestic quarrels; we have moderates and extremists; we have non-co-operators; and we have Hindus and Mahomedans. But so far as this question is concerned, let me tell you with all the sincerity that I am capable of that we stand absolutely united. Do not be mis-guided by what appears in certain papers here which attempt to show that there is no feeling on this question. We attach far more importance to the honour of our nationals in other parts of the Empire than probably you realize.

QUESTION OF "IZZAT"

We express that feeling in the varnacular of our own country by a comprehensive and delicate phrase, which I have no doubt will readily be understood by Lord Curzon and His Highness the Maharajah—that phrase is "Izzat." There is not a man either among the Princes or among the humblest subjects of His Majesty who does not attach great importance to that question of "Izzat." When "Izzat" (which means honour) is at stake, we prefer death to anything else. That is our sentiment, and it is in that light that I present my case to you.

INDIA'S POSITION IN THE EMPIRE

Do not forget that my country, India, is the one country which makes the British Empire truly Imperial. I take pride in that. I do not indulge in the slightest degree in reflection upon the dignity or honour or position of any one of the Dominions, but I do claim that it is my country which makes the British Empire truly Imperial. One-fifth of the human race, with a far more ancient civilization than your own, to which eloquent reference has been made by Lord Peel, joins with you in acknowledging the suzerainty of our common Throne. That allegiance with us is a real living thing. Shake that allegiance, and you shake the foundations of the entire fabric, with consequences which it is difficult to overestimate.

FUNCTION OF THE CONFERENCE

Might I explain to you here the considerations which will guide me in presenting my case to you? In my humble judgment, the one function of this Conference—the highest advisory body of the Empire—is to bring about a good understanding between the various units that constitute the British Commonwealth, to strengthen the ties which unite, or ought to unite, the different units of the Empire with their different outlook and their different religions. If this Conference fails to achieve that end, then let me say it fails to justify its existence in the eyes of the Empire. But to achieve that end, it seems to me that it is absolutely necessary that we should open out our minds to each other with entire frankness. Any mental reservation on an occasion like this, and round this table, would, in my humble judgment, amount to nothing short of treason against the King and treason against the Empire. It is in that spirit of frankness, in that spirit of candour, that I will venture to present to you my case, and, even though I may use now and again expressions to indicate the strength of my feeling and the feeling of my countrymen, I beg of the Dominion Prime Ministers not to misunderstand my spirit.

INDIAN SENTIMENT ON PROBLEM NOT CONFINED TO INTELLECTUALS

Let me tell you at once that the feeling on this question in India is deep-seated and widespread. Let me also remove a very wrong impression, and I am glad that Lord Peel has referred to this question for I desire to reinforce his arguments as an Indian. Twenty-seven years I have been in public life; thirteen years I have been connected with the legislative Councils, and I have sat in the Viceroy's Cabinet. I have never witnessed before what is happening in India to-day. Five years ago it may have been possible for you to say that a wide gulf divided the masses from the classes. Let me now give you this warning. The classes lead the masses as never before. India has rapidly changed, and that is the outstanding feature of the situation there. The intellectuals, or, if you like to call them, agitators, have gained ascendancy over the masses. What the intellectuals think to-day the masses will think to-morrow.

This question now before us, let me tell you, affects directly the masses, for it is from the masses mainly that most of our population has gone to the Dominions. I belong to a province which has supplied a considerable number of men to the various Dominions, and I know their feelings. You may condemn the agitators, you may condemn the intellectual classes; I will not quarrel with that, but remember they have got power now with the masses.

INFLUENCE OF VERNACLAR PRESS

Do not forget the growing and increasing influence of the vernacular press. I do not justify or vindicate its attitude in every respect. I will, however, state the facts. It now penetrates into the innermost recesses of our villages, and every village has got a reader who reads for the illiterate people the vernacular newspapers. I have been reading extracts from the vernacular press of my own country, and, while I do deprecate the wild language in which it has indulged, let me tell you frankly that it is seething with indignation over this question, and that it is affecting the whole outlook of my countrymen in the villages.

SERIOUSNESS OF SITUATION

Any inequality of Indian nationals enters like iron into our souls. For Heaven's sake, whether you find a solution or whether you do not find a solution, do not dismiss this statement of mine as mere sentimental nonsense. It is an absolute fact, and I am here to interpret to you the present position of my countrymen in regard to this question; it cuts to the quick our national pride and our new consciousness. It permeates and sours our whole outlook in regard to Imperial relationship. It derives impetus from the natural inclination to take pride in being a member of the biggest Commonwealth that the world knows to-day. It makes the task of the Government of India, of which I had the honour of being a member until a few months ago, infinitely more difficult in dealing with their domestic problems than you realize. Here I must reinforce the arguments of Lord Peel. This feeling runs right through our national life.

FEELING OVER KENYA QUESTION

Let me at once tell you that I am not willing to enter at length into the merits of the Kenya decision, but my countrymen expect me, and my Government expects me, and I am bound by all considerations of honour and duty, to put you in full possession of the sentiments of my countrymen and of my Government in regard to your decision. They have received that decision with the utmost possible dismay. I know the official view is that in certain respects our position in Kenya has been improved. That is not a view we share. We judge you by a standard which is admittedly very high. We were not fighting for little things; we were fighting for a big principle. I know and I feel, and my countrymen feel, and my Government feels, that a serious blunder has been made. I know also that British statesmanship is wise, and whenever a thing goes wrong it begins to think, and I honestly believe that it will soon recognize the mistake which it has made. Let me tell you, on behalf of my countrymen, that neither my country nor the Government which I have the honour to represent will accept this decision as final. Indeed, there is nothing final in politics, and I want His Majesty's Government to recognize that position and to indicate, if possible, that they do look upon that question in the light in which I have just presented it. May I conclude this portion of my speech by assuring the Conference that while on domestic questions of Indian politics we, like most of you, have our differences of parties, groups and interests, yet, upon this question

which concerns the honour of our nationals in Kenya, and the honour of our nationals overseas, there is no difference between us, from the Viceroy downwards?

VIEWS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

May I remind you of what the distinguished and eminent statesman, with whom I had the privilege of working in close co-operation for two years, and to whom I hope my countrymen and his countrymen will do justice some day, said on a critical occasion to the legislative Assembly when the announcement of the Kenya decision was published in India? I will quote from his speech.

"The news of the decision regarding Kenya," said Lord Reading, "came to me and my Government no less than to you as a great and severe disappointment; for India had made the cause of Indians in Kenya her own. As His Majesty's Government has stated, this decision conflicts on material points with the strongly expressed views of my Government as laid before the Cabinet by the Secretary of State for India." That is the opinion of the Viceroy.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF NON-OFFICIAL FEELING

May I crave your indulgence just for two minutes to read out to you a few typical telegrams which I have received during the last few days, some of them from absolutely unexpected quarters. They have come to me from representative bodies of all shades of opinion. Mr. Sastri, who has been so frequently, during the last few years, connected with this matter, sends me a telegram supporting the proposals, not without misgivings, which I am going to put before you at present. Now, the Swaraj Party, to which I do not belong, and which does not see eye to eye with me, and from which I should never have expected to receive support, sends this telegram from Poona, through its Secretary and leader, M. Kilkar: "Maharashtra Swarajya Party offers you full support any strong action you take to get redress Kenya wrong." Let me tell you again that most of the telegrams come from unexpected quarters.

UNEXPECTED TESTIMONY

Well, here is a most remarkable telegram from a gentleman with whom I worked in full co-operation until five years ago, but from whom I separated when differences arose. Pandit Madan Mohon Malaviya now belongs to the non-co-operation Party, and three days ago, if you would have asked me, I should never have said that I would receive a telegram like this from that gentleman. It is from a man with forty years solid work behind him, and this is his telegram. It is sent to me from Simla.

> "Indians all shades public opinion at one with you in demanding equality status with fellow subjects throughout British Empire. If representatives other parts not prepared give practical support this elementary right Indians as citizens Empire, participation Indians Imperial Conference becomes mockery, deep national humiliation, and trust both you and Maharajah of Alwar will withdraw."

I have received two telegrams from Mrs. Besant, giving support to me on her own behalf and on behalf of her entire Party. Let me tell you that while I am her friend I do not belong to her Party.

TELEGRAM FROM GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

Lastly, may I give to you the telegram which was handed over to me the day before yesterday, which has come to me from the Government of India. It says: "We understand from Reuters that Conference will discuss overseas

questions probably on 24th. The resolution passed recently by a majority of the Bombay Corporation to boycott Empire goods, where possible, as a protest against the Kenya decision, and a resolution on the same lines of the Poona public meeting, further indicate the importance attached to equality of status overseas, and we sincerely hope that the proceedings of the Conference will restore confidence and good feeling. As regards 'C' Mandates, we trust that the atmosphere will permit you to secure a favourable solution, otherwise India's right to revision of the policy must be reserved. Sapru's proposal in letter to Sir Narasimha Sarma to reserve the right to challenge policy when India's interests are affected, though substantially the same as ours, is less elastic. We earnestly hope that you have secured Smuts' agreement to abandon or modify the segregation policy as suggested in our despatch. We attach very great importance to it. We hope also that the Dominions and the Colonial Office will consent to the appointment of Agents to assist them and us in this difficult question as suggested in our memorandum. Please send copy of the telegram to Sapru."

I will not take up your time further. I have tried only to reinforce the argument which Lord Peel put forward by showing how the different classes of our people are agreed on this question.

PRESENT POSITION OF INDIANS OVERSEAS

Having explained the depth and implication of Indian feeling, I will now proceed to explain the circumstances in various parts of the world by which this feeling is at present aggravated. I have been studying such official papers as are available to me, and, for the sake of convenience and to save your time, I propose to read out to you a very brief summary of the position. There are about 1½ million Indians now settled in other parts of the Empire, and in many parts they are subjected, as Indians, and quite irrespective of how well they shape up to local franchise standards, to grave political and even economic disabilities.

NEW ZEALAND

Let me start my brief survey of these grievances by paying a tribute to the Government of New Zealand, which is represented by my distinguished friend over there. That Government, in its own territory at least, treats Indians on a footing of equality with all other inhabitants of the country. And my countrymen can live there among the New Zealanders as fellow-citizens in honour.

AUSTRALIA

In Australia also the disabilities which Indians suffer are comparatively small. We hope that before long legislation will be passed to enable them to exercise the Dominion franchise, and to remove the disqualification they at present suffer in regard to invalid and old-age pensions. In certain provinces also there are minor disabilities which I hope it will not be hard to remove. In Queensland they have no State franchise; and they have to undergo a dictation test for employment in the sugar and dairy industries, which is apt to operate prejudicially. In Western Australia also they have no State franchise, while in Southern Australia they are disqualified for leases under the Irrigation Act. Let me tell you plainly that, if I have failed in this statement to convince Mr. Bruce, I hope he will at least extend to me the hand of fellowship on this question; I am willing to co-operate with him to devise methods for a solution of these difficulties.

CANADA

In Canada, of which Mr. Mackenzie King is the distinguished Prime Minister, there is a small population—I hope he will correct me if I am wrong—of not more than 6,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Over 1,200.

Sir TEJ BAHADUR SAPRU: Thank you very much. In British Columbia there is no Dominion, Provincial or Municipal franchise.

SOUTH AFRICA

Now I come to the most difficult part of my task. I come to South Africa. In South Africa the problem is most serious. Here there are 161,000 Indians, of which all but a few thousands, mainly resident in Cape Colony, have no political franchise. In Natal, besides this, they fear to lose the municipal franchise. In the Transvaal there is no franchise of any kind. Nor is it only of political subjection that my countrymen complain. They also suffer under severe economic handicaps. In Natal they are restrained from acquiring town lands in townships. In the Transvaal they are prohibited, either as individuals or as companies, from acquiring land: and in the Gold Area they may not occupy land. To make their lot more miserable, the laws governing the grant and regulation of traders' licenses are administered in a manner which strikes directly at their own interests. Moreover, the Union Government, of which my friend, General Smuts, is the head, is even now contemplating legislation which will provide for the compulsory segregation of Indians in urban areas by restrictions on the ownership and occupation of land.

REFERENCES TO PREVIOUS STATEMENTS BY GENERAL SMUTS AND MR. BURTON

May I be permitted, at this stage, to invite the attention of the Conference to a curious discrepancy between this very serious state of affairs and the sentiments enunciated in 1917. I believe in this very hall? General Smuts then said,* and I quote his very words:—

> "Once the white community in South Africa were rid of the fear that they were going to be flooded by unlimited immigration from India" (a fear removed once and for all by India's acceptance of the Reciprocity Resolution of 1917) "all the other questions would be considered subsidiary and would become easily and perfectly soluble."

May I also remind you of what Mr. Burton said† on a former occasion at the Imperial Conference, and I attach considerable importance to the testimony he has given as to the character of my countrymen in South Africa? Mr. Burton said: "As far as we are concerned, it is only fair to say, and it is the truth, that we have found that the Indians in our midst in South Africa, who form in some parts a very substantial portion of the population, are good, law-abiding, quiet citizens, and it is our duty to see, as he [sic], Sir S. P. Sinha) expressed it, that they are treated as human beings, with feelings like our own and in a proper manner."

COLONIES. BRITISH GUIANA

From the self-governing Dominions I shall pass on to the Colonies and very briefly allude to our position there. In British Guiana I gladly acknowledge that our Indian population can live on terms of honour and equality of treatment. Their grievances are comparatively very much fewer.

---

*See page 119 of Cd. 8566.
†See page 199 of Cd. 9177.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 37a

FIJI

In Fiji my countrymen demand more adequate representation, based on a satisfactory franchise, in the legislative bodies; they also ask for the settlement of a minimum wage based on the cost of living; they ask for the removal of the poll tax, which presses very hardly upon them. They ask further that land should be given to them for settlement. They ask, and I have received a cable from an important quarter, that if these grievances are not removed they should be repatriated.

KENYA

In Kenya the Indians desire a common roll instead of command franchise. They protest against the administrative veto, which prevents them acquiring land from willing European sellers in the highlands; and they fear that the immigration restrictions may be employed in such a way as to prejudice the development of the colony by Indians.

UGANDA AND TANGANYIKA

In Uganda the Indians are pressing for representation by two nominated members of the Legislative Council; and in Tanganyika, which my countrymen helped to win for the Empire, they have certain grievances which, I understand, are at present under the consideration of the Colonial Office, such as Profits Tax, peddlers' licences and the trade licences, and may I express a fervent hope that the Colonial Office will give most sympathetic consideration to those grievances before they arrive at any decision?

Thus, wherever we may turn, we see circumstances in the local status of Indians which are not to be reconciled with India's national aspirations or with the position which she will obtain as the result of the declared policy of His Majesty's Government—a position which I hope to achieve much sooner than some people realize.

"C" MANDATES

At this stage I will slightly digress from my argument and refer to the "C" Mandates in a very few words. In regard to the administration of what I will call the "C" Mandated Territories which have been committed to the charge of certain Dominions, I desire to say that my countrymen cannot acquiesce in any position which does or may in the future make their status inferior to what it was when those territories were administered by Germany. I have already read to you the views of the Government of India in the telegram. The matter is at present not of very great practical importance as the number of my countrymen is very small; but I must in fairness enter a caveat against any action which may in future turn to our disadvantage. May I also in this connection remind you of the provisions of Article 22 of the League of Nations? I will only quote the material portions. After referring to Central African and other peoples, it lays down the Mandatory Power, besides certain other duties, shall "secure equal opportunities for the trade and commerce of other Members of the League." I take my stand on that.

RESOLUTION OF 1921 CONFERENCE

Having thus reviewed the position in the self-governing Dominions and the Colonies according to the information available to me— and I shall not object to any Member of this Conference correcting me if I am wrong in any detail—let me tell you what the position was that was taken by this Confer-

ence in 1921.* Lord Peel read out to us a portion of that Resolution, but I propose to read out to you the whole of that Resolution; that Resolution runs as follows: —

> "The Conference, while reaffirming the Resolution of the Imperial War Conference of 1918 that each community of the British Commonwealth should enjoy complete control of the composition of its own population by means of restriction on immigration from any of the other communities, recognizes that there is an incongruity between the position of India as an equal member of the British Empire and the existence of disabilities upon British Indians lawfully domiciled in some other parts of the Empire. The Conference accordingly is of the opinion that in the interests of the solidarity of the British Commonwealth it is desirable that the rights of such Indians to citizenship should be recognized.
>
> "The representatives of South Africa regret their inability to accept this Resolution in view of the exceptional circumstances of the greater part of the Union.
>
> "The representatives of India, while expressing their appreciation of the acceptance of the Resolution recorded above, feel bound to place on record their profound concern at the position of Indians in South Africa, and their hope that by negotiation between the Governments of India and of South Africa some way can be found, as soon as may be, to reach a more satisfactory position."

IMMIGRATION QUESTION DOES NOT ARISE

You will thus see that the resolution divides itself clearly into three parts. I will take up the first part which deals with the question of immigration. It gives each Dominion the fullest and the freest right to regulate the character and the composition of its own population. I am bound by that. You are bound by it, but just as I am bound by it you are also bound in honour by the second part of the resolution, which really is the most vital part with which I have got to deal, except, of course, that portion which relates to South Africa. But before I proceed further let me make one point clear. Let there be no misgiving about the question of immigration. There is a growing sentiment in my country that we should not send our nationals outside anywhere, and I may perhaps make a confession, with the permission of the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State, regarding my attitude when I was a member of the Government of India. I helped to draft the Immigration Act, and I was the President of the Committee which sat to consider it. I was probably the strongest exponent of the view that there should be no immigration from India outside on any conditions whatsoever. We do not want our nation outside India to appear as a nation of coolies. We have had enough of that. There is plenty of scope for the conservation of the energy of my countrymen in my own country. We want them to rise to the full height of their stature in our own country. The Dominions therefore need have no fear on that account.

NECESSITY OF IMPLEMENTING RESOLUTION

I have just said that, as I felt bound in honour by the first part of the resolution, I consider, and I hope that I am not demanding anything extravagant from you, that you are also in honour bound by the second part of the resolution. I will be absolutely frank. I will exclude South Africa, because South

*See page 8 of Cmd. 1474.

Africa stood out. I make no appeal to South Africa on the basis of the second part of the resolution, but I will ask the other Dominion Prime Ministers what my countrymen, and what my Government, are asking in India, namely, what steps have been taken, or are proposed to be taken, to honour this three-year-old agreement? While every reasonable man must make allowances for practical difficulties in the implementing of that resolution, while I recognize the difficulties arising from local circumstances and prejudices, from the slow changes of public opinion, and from the exigencies of party politics, yet, I must tell you, the question, to us, is one of vital importance, and in fairness to my country I must say that she finds herself absolutely unable to acquiesce in the present position. I have, therefore, come to you in the name of my Government, and in the name of the many millions of my countrymen, to make an earnest appeal, a sincere appeal, to join hands with me in devising some methods such as your statesmanship will enable you to do, methods intended to give effect to the principle of equality embodied in that resolution, the resolution of 1921. Do not for a moment think that I fail to recognize your difficulties. I have held office, and I know the difficult position of responsible Ministers. I am not blind to those difficulties, but pray let me ask you also to realize our national difficulties and my difficulties.

PROBLEM MUST BE FACED IN A SPIRIT OF CO-OPERATION

I invite you to face with me in the broadest spirit of statesmanship this vital problem that Lord Peel and I have had the honour of placing before you this morning, and I claim your co-operation in devising methods of solving this problem. After a long and careful consideration I have come to the conclusion that I must place certain definite constructive suggestions for your consideration. If you, on your side can make better suggestions to me, if you can offer any better alternatives to me, take it from me that you will not find anyone more ready than myself to accept them. I earnestly suggest that what the occasion demands is a united effort if we are to find a solution of this difficult problem, a problem which threatens at no distant date to acquire almost the character of a problem of foreign policy. I appeal to the Dominion Governments and to His Majesty's Government to take a united course.

A CONSTRUCTIVE PROPOSAL.

I will now tell you what my resolution or proposal is. I have reduced it to writing, and with your permission I will read it. My resolution is: Let the Dominion Governments, who have an Indian population, let His Majesty's Government in areas under their direct control, such as Kenya, Uganda, Fiji, and other places where there are Indians resident, appoint committees to confer with a committee, which the Government of India will send from India, in exploring the avenues how best and how soonest the principle of equality implicit in the 1921 resolution may be implemented. And, lest the course of the enquiry be prejudiced, I will couple with my proposal the request that any anti-Indian legislation which may be pending should be stayed until the report of these joint committees is available. That is my resolution. At once I propose to remove any misapprehension which may be lurking in the minds of anyone who has listened to me. I do not want a Central Committee. Let me tell you, I want a Committee appointed by each Dominion within its own borders, and I want the Committee appointed by each Dominion to confer with the Committee which will be appointed by the Government of India, and which will go to each Dominion. That is my appeal to the Dominions, except, of course, to South Africa, under the resolution of 1921. I make the same earnest appeal to His Majesty's Government, and especially to His Grace the Duke of Devonshire and the Colonial Office, in so far as the resolution relates to the Colonies.

ITS ADVANTAGES

I will, in a few words, tell you what, in my humble judgment, are the advantages to be gained from my resolution. In the first place, you gain time, and that will enable us to calm the angry passions that have arisen in India on this question. In the second place, India will be undoubtedly in a more hopeful frame of mind, and we all of us can bring all the more forces available to us to bear upon the solution of this problem. In the third place, my resolution absolutely safeguards your independence, I mean the independence of the Dominions. It places the initiative in your hands, and let me tell you, it is not merely because I am anxious that the Dominions should have that independence that I have provided that safeguard, but also because of a lurking feeling of self-interest in my mind. You have received a rich inheritance of independence, freedom and self-government in your territories. I am still aspiring to it. I hope my aspirations will be realized very soon, and then, like you, I shall be jealous of any outside authority imposing its will upon me in my affairs. It is for that reason that I am anxious that the Dominions themselves should take the initiative in regard to this Committee which I have suggested and to the Committee which we propose to send out from India to confer with you in your countries. I think, and I honestly believe, if the problem is explored on those lines it will be found that it does not in the end prove to be insoluble.

SOUTH AFRICA. ADDRESS TO GENERAL SMUTS

I now turn perhaps to the most difficult part of my work, and that is my address to General Smuts. I frankly recognize that I cannot address him on the basis of the resolution of 1921. He was no party to it. But I address him on three specific grounds: first of all, as a humanitarian; secondly, as an Imperial statesman; thirdly, as the Prime Minister of South Africa.

AS A HUMANITARIAN

As a humanitarian I say he cannot absolve himself of the moral duty which rests on his shoulders of elevating the status of my countrymen within his Dominion. Let it be granted that their standard is low; it makes his task all the more imperative and urgent that he should help them in raising that standard. My countrymen, and I wish to say it emphatically, are as much strangers in South Africa as Englishmen or as General Smuts. The assistance of my countrymen, like the assistance of General Smuts and others, has helped in building up the prosperity of South Africa; and let him not forget my countrymen now when it lies in his power to raise their standard. He cannot permanently relegate them to a position of inferiority; for therein lies a menace not to his country or to mine, but to the Empire.

AS AN IMPERIAL STATESMAN

I appeal to him next as an Imperial statesman. Ever since the days of the Armistice, what is it that General Smuts has stood up for? He has stood up for peace, peace to all the world; and he has stood as the protector of minorities. He has acquired a unique position as an Imperial statesman. It has given him world-wide fame. What is it that we have observed during the last three weeks of the sitting of this Conference? General Smuts has been trying to devise means to bring peace to a distracted world. Is he going to exclude from that happy mission of his, his country and mine? For let me tell you that there shall be no peace unless he includes his country and my country within the ambit of his big proposals. I do not address him on the basis of

the resolution of 1921; I do not wish to interfere with his very natural desire to be consistent. I appeal to him independently of that resolution, and I say to him: "Will you not join hands with me, as I have appealed to the other Dominion Prime Ministers,. in devising methods for the solution of this problem now and for all time?" I do not indulge in any threat; that is not in my line; and I hope General Smuts will not misunderstand me. However powerful he may be in South Africa, and however weak we may be in India, you cannot relegate my countrymen for all time in King George's Empire to a position of inferiority.

AS PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

I will now address General Smuts as the Prime Minister of South Africa. Does he fully realize the implication of his present policy? I doubt whether he does. Will he not be aggravating the trouble not merely in South Africa, but throughout the world, by putting the white people on one side and the coloured races on the other side? I tell him frankly that if the Indian problem in South Africa is allowed to fester much longer it will pass, as I said just now, beyond the bounds of a domestic issue and will become a question of foreign policy of such gravity that upon it the unity of the Empire may founder irretrievably. I therefore earnestly trust that he will not refuse to co-operate with me in attempting to discover a solution, and I also hope that, in view of the present seriousness of a situation to which my Government and my people have referred more often than I can repeat here, he will agree to the appointment of a Diplomatic Agent to be sent by the Government of India to South Africa, who will protect our nationals there, who will act as an intermediary between them and the South African Government and who will put our Government in full possession of the facts relating to our nationals.

PROPOSALS CONTAINED IN GENERAL SMUTS' MEMORANDUM

I will very briefly make a reference to the proposals which General Smuts has been good enough to circulate in a memorandum* among the members of this Conference. I have read them with very great care and with all the attention and weight to which a memorandum of General Smuts is entitled. Let me tell him, and let me tell you all, that it is a document of remarkable subtlety, such subtlety as I have always been accustomed to associate with the name of General Smuts. In the first place, General Smuts takes exception to what Mr. Sastri has been saying or doing. I do not hold a brief for Mr. Sastri. He has been an intimate friend of mine and a fellow-worker in public life during the last twenty years. If the only objection General Smuts has got to find with him, and if the only crime to be attributed to him, is that he has in the Dominions frankly and freely pleaded for the equality of his countrymen, then let me tell General Smuts that he is indicating not merely Mr. Sastri, bu 320 million of my countrymen. We all plead guilty to that charge.

IMPLICATIONS OF MEMORANDUM

I will refer no more to the personal issue, but I will ask you first of all to consider the implications of that important memorandum. General Smuts compares the British Commonwealth to the League of Nations, but I say emphatically that analogy may hold good up to a certain point, but after that breaks down. The League of Nations has no common Sovereign. The British Commonwealth has a common Sovereign, and we are united to him by our

---

*See page 138.

allegiance to him. But if the British Commonwealth is to be compared with the League of Nations, you cannot stop short of the full extent to which that analogy must be applied. What it it that the League of Nations has been created for? It has been created, as I understand it, to settle disputes between the various Governments by conference, by consultation, and will do so unless they refuse to come to that conference and that consultation. But it is just this consultation and conference which General Smuts, as I understand, is refusing. What is it that a resolution like his comes to? It asks the Dominion Prime Ministers, who took part in the Conference of 1921 and agreed to that Resolution, now to treat it is a "scrap of paper" and to join him in passing an absolutely new Resolution which, on the face of it, has for its object the reservation of the fullest freedom of each Dominion to pass its own laws regarding Franchise.

PRACTICAL LIMITS TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF DOMINIONS

Nobody has doubted that Constitutional right, but there are limits to that Constitutional right, limits which are prescribed by prudence. Let me illustrate that. The British Parliament here is a Sovereign Parliament, and the Free State Parliament in Ireland is also an independent Parliament. Suppose the Irish Free State Parliament passed, or intended to pass, legislation to the effect that it would not recognize the right of any Protestant or Englishman to the Franchise in Ireland, and suppose, on the other hand, the British Parliament intended to pass legislation to disenfranchise all Irishmen settled in Scotland; well, if you looked at it strictly from the legal point of view you might say that these Parliaments would be within their right, but prudence would at once prescribe limits to the exercise of that power, that constitutional right. The first impulse of the two Parliaments would be to confer, to devise methods of avoiding a conflict. Will they not do it? Yes. I recognize the constitutional liberty and the constitutional rights of the Dominion Governments, but let me tell you this, that constitutional rights can only be exercised with prudence and discretion up to a certain point, and beyond that point you have to allow those constitutional rights to be subordinated to statesmanship, to prudence and to discretion. Well, I do not wish to raise a legal argument. I hope no legal argument will be raised, because this is not a legal body. There is only one thing I will say. General Smuts has said that the one binding tie between the Dominions and other parts of the Empire and India is our common allegiance to the common Sovereign, but he has coupled that statement with a further proposition, viz., that from that allegiance political rights do not flow.

CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE NOT TO BE RAISED HERE

Well, I will not have a duel with General Smuts on a point of constitutional law, but I will venture to tell him one thing. Allegiance to the Sovereign is a very living thing. It is not a mere figure of speech, and, whenever you pass any law which affects the allegiance of the subject to the sovereign and the corresponding duty of protection of the sovereign to the subject, you tread on very dangerous ground. If a constitutional position like that is to be argued, let it be argued before a legal body, and, speaking for myself, with all humility, I have no fear of facing that constitutional issue on legal grounds, but I do not wish to raise that legal argument at this Conference.

APPEAL TO THE CONFERENCE. INDIA'S POSITION IN EMPIRE

I have practically reviewed the whole position and I will now make an appeal to the Conference itself. I will appeal to the Conference to realize to the full the implications of the Indian problem. I have placed before my

colleagues from the Dominions and His Majesty's Government here certain specific proposals. I believe, and honestly believe, that the British Empire stands for justice and equality in the eyes of the world. Will you make a place within it for India? Think for a moment of the present position. Ancient and modern history provides no parallel to it. Three hundred and twenty million of my countrymen, whose religion is different from yours, whose colour is different from yours, whose race is different from yours, whose history is different from yours, are united by the common tie of allegiance to the common sovereign. They are members of a commonwealth the like of which has never existed before and let me tell you, that, while I do not wish to interfere with your absolute independence inside your own borders, I am one of those men who say that the British Empire can never be described as an exclusively white Empire. Within its borders it comprises a large number of populations of coloured races. Now, how are you going to keep Indians, or for that matter, all the other coloured races, within that Empire? By force? Never, because apart from the obvious limitations of force you cannot be untrue to your own traditions of liberty, justice and equality; you cannot afford to ignore and neglect the world opinion on this question. By preserving and safeguarding our sentiments? Certainly. That will be the strongest tie you can have and it remains for you to make use of it. Fulfil our aspirations within our own country for self-government, fulfil our aspirations for a position of equality inside the Dominions and inside the Colonies, and India will stand shoulder to shoulder with you through thick and thin. It is by preserving that sentiment that you can keep India and I pray, with all the sincerity I am capable of, that this Conference may come to some decisions which may strengthen the bonds between the Empire and India, for I do believe in that connection. Make no mistake, it is by sentiment and by the preservation of that sentiment that you will retain us and enable us to achieve self-government and to satisfy our other national ambitions outside our own country.

WHAT INDIA MEANS

Think for a moment what India means to you. More than three hundred million men are closely allied to other Asiatics, constituting almost the entire half of humanity. They are placed within the ambit of the British Empire. If we are incorporated within the commonwealth, think what we shall mean to the peace of the world, with our ideals of self-government, bridging as we do the East and the West, shouldering burdens which are yours as well as ours for the service of humanity.

COMMON LOYALTY TO CROWN

Think again of the ties which bind us together, if you will allow them to do so. King George is your King, but our Sovereign. The devotion to his person and to his throne is a very real thing notwithstanding what some wild and extravagant men may say in my country. I claim, and let me be very plain, not as a matter of grace, but as a matter of right, as the King's subject, to have an honourable place in his household, a position of equality and honour within the Empire, wherever it may be; for to us our position in his household overseas is of far greater importance than any other questions which are agitating our minds at the present moment. I am fighting in this spirit, fighting as a firm believer in the connection of India with England, fighting as a loyal and devoted subject of the King, as one who has had the honour of serving him in his Government in India, and I am fighting for the honour of my country before you all, my plea—indeed the plea of all my countrymen, is for equality within the great King's Empire, including his Dominions. On that there can be no faltering or weakening on my part. I invite you to devise means with me to give effect to this cherished ambition of my countrymen.

APPEAL TO PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN AND HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT

May I now make an appeal to the Prime Minister? Sir, you are the head of His Majesty's Government. Let me tell you that every single word that falls from you on this occasion will be read and re-read and analyzed in my country from one end to the other.

I now want to make an appeal to the Prime Minister and to his colleagues. Do not send His Highness the Maharajah, do not send me, back to India to say that I have attempted to seek justice at this greatest advisory council of the Empire and that I have failed. I speak with all earnestness. One single gesture from His Majesty's Government, one single expression of sympathy put into practice, one honest attempt made to try to find a solution, will allay the situation in India in a manner which you do not realize. I am afraid that I have trespassed too much on your time and I beg your pardon. I also thank you for the patient and courteous manner in which you have listened to me; but the cause of my country demanded that I should put my whole case before you frankly and to the best of my ability.

STATEMENT BY HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJAH OF ALWAR

The Maharajah of Alwar: Prime Minister and Friends, I join in the echo of thanks to the Prime Minister for having set aside a day specially for discussing the problem of Indians overseas, a question which, I believe, will be tackled with all the goodwill that I see around me, and will help, when it reaches its final stages, to allay the great amount of feeling that is at present rather prominent in the minds of my countrymen. To-day is India's day, and, as these words come before my vision, thoughts and ideas of all kinds surge through my mind, some of emotion, some of patriotism, others of unity of the Empire; but coloured as they are by comparatively narrow ideas of nationalism, citizenship, political rights and freedom, they pale into almost insignificance before the dominating sunlight of the feelings and ideas of common brotherhood. But I have to speak to-day of mundane affairs, the sordid affairs of the political arena, and about the very life and existence in this material world of some unprotected communities. I must perforce descend from the high and exhilarating heights and leave my pedestal, which is yours also, by birthright, as of every individual either inside this room or outside it—nay, of all fellowbeings within the four corners of the Empire. I do so, Sir, I hope, only temporarily, to try and find my level again in the life of love where we were all intended to live, and sometimes try to get to.

INDIA DIVIDED INTO BRITISH INDIA AND THE INDIAN STATES

Now, before going further, I will briefly halt to touch, in passing, on a subject that is known to many of you already, but which, I know, is not known to some. You know that India is divided into two parts, or rather, more correctly speaking, I should say into two administrative spheres. Two thirds of that country is called British India, and is under the direct sovereignty of His Majesty the Emperor and his Government, with all its machinery of Parliament, Cabinets, Government of India, and so forth. There is the other one-third, which is governed by the Indian Princes and Chiefs, whose subjects are the subjects of their own rulers, and who have, not from to-day, but from six to eight generations, been in alliance by means of treaties, Sanads, engagements, etc., originally formed with the British East India Company, but the responsibilties of which were taken over by the Crown in 1858. These systems are not the growth of

yesterday, but the survival of a régime of hundreds of centuries, yet able to imbibe and assimilate such progress as is compatible with our traditions, religions, ideas and environments. I have trespassed on your time with regard to these matters, as they will bear an important part on what I have to say later. I intend to speak to-day, not merely as a representative of the Princes, but also, and even more so, as an Indian, than whom I believe no one regards his motherland more sacred, and who wishes nothing more than that she shall receive justice from the British Government, in whose hands her destiny is placed, and co-operation from her sister States who form the comity of nations in our Empire. Let me say at the outset that I have no vain threats to place before you—for the simple reason that they go against the very principle of "Co-operation" which I placed before myself on entering the precincts of this room the first day of our Conference. I will say, furthermore, that while, on the one hand, I have nothing to beg, and I will not beg, I also make no demands, as I have no demands to make. But the motherland, whose salt I eat, the land whose soil has given me birth, tells me that it is my duty to place in plain, untarnished, but candid form in words before you all the facts of our case, such as I know them.

PUBLICITY

And now, Prime Ministers, I have one request to make, and that is that every word I utter or have uttered to-day in my statement may be cabled in full to my countrymen and in no hashed or pruned form. I do not desire this because I seek cheap notoriety by making Gallery Shots, but because my countrymen have the right to know every word I say in their name. They may have some things to criticize and others which they may not entirely like. It is in justice to them, speaking, not as their representative, but as one of them, that I therefore do not wish to say anything behind their backs, 7,000 miles away, which I will not gladly say to their face.

BRITISH EMPIRE STANDS FOR JUSTICE AND FREEDOM

I will now proceed. We believe that the greatest assets to the British Empire lie in its championing the cause of freedom and justice. It is because I feel, my country feels—rightly or wrongly—that freedom and justice are at stake as exercised, or perhaps as understood, that I want to speak these words. I hope they will be in the interests of the Empire, and it will be something done—if nothing more—if misunderstandings and misapprehensions that do exist are somehow removed. It will be all the greater glory to you all—and I speak of no tinsel glory, but the glory of the heart—if the British Government and the Great Dominions will show by words, and prove by action, that they mean to assist one of their sisters who is old in age, but also at present the weakest member on the chess-board of the political game.

DESPONDENCY IN INDIA

I hear wails from India itself—and now I speak principally of that two-thirds—conveying the feelings of despondency. The words of my fellow brethren, of my country, seem to ring in my ears: Are we going to progress steadily, progressively, yet not too slowly towards our goal, which the other sister nations have been more fortunate in already achieving—the goal of having the power to govern our own country as a loyal and integral part of the Empire? Are we going to be helped affectionately and with kindly feeling to the goal which has been pronounced publicly by the British Government, and more than which we do not aspire to, of being a loyal self-governing Dominion within the Empire? Is everything going to be done to accelerate our progress, or is our progress

under various pretexts to be retarded and delayed? Have we a long number of years before us of a great furnace to pass through, from which Ireland has only just emerged?

Sometimes I am afraid this despondency has been seen to give rise to despair, which has resulted in giving exhibitions in many places of those hideous atrocities at which the British Government, as the Custodians of our country, do not feel happy, and of which we, as its sons, are certainly not proud. If India had some more definite proposition before it than having to wait every ten years for its destiny to be enhanced, if it had reasonable assurance of rapid but progressive advancement, I believe that self-government, which is the goal of us all, for two-thirds India could be achieved, early and smoothly. I add this despite anything that may be said to the contrary, that the achievement is possible within a very much shorter period than some people would like to have us believe. I know, and I do not need to be told, that it depends to a great extent on India's capacity herself. I agree, but surely you do not desire to throw India entirely on her own resources? Does she not look to Britain to give her periodical and sustained assistance, so that my country may be, as it has been in the past, really and genuinely a grateful and loyal partner of your wonderful heritage?

SOLUTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PROBLEM IN INDIA

I am speaking of self-government for two-thirds India, and, in dealing with this subject, I hope I may seek your indulgence for another few moments. The solution, I firmly believe, will not lie in grafting Western principles of political government on to the East with a stroke of the pen. Already many old bottles have cracked into which this new wine has been poured. I would much rather you get India round a table in confidence, and work out, with her sons, plans and methods that would be best suited to her environment, by which she can obtain her goal in the most rapid, but, at the same time, most peaceful and loyal manner. I say it is possible, and probable of early success, and you will be doing something for 300 millions of human beings that will cement them to you with gratitude and brotherly feelings.

The world was not built for academic or pious assurances spread over a number of years, the fulfilment of which may well pass over a lifetime. But what seems to me is this—and that is why I have mentioned this subject and in connection therewith I will say no more—that the whole problem, if viewed with breadth of vision and imagination, is really, Oh! so simple. It is not such a hedgehog as may be conceived by those who do not come in close contact with it; and it is really still capable of a solution which will leave a stronger England and a loving India.

In the end, in this connection, I will only say this much. Many unpleasant incidents have taken place in India of late years. I have no desire to lift before you the veil to disclose tales of woe or wails of lamentation.

Many mistakes have undoubtedly been made on both sides. So far as India's side of the picture is concerned, it will be a regrettable spot on India's fair name, and I say this in all solemnity, that any grievances which India may have had, and did have, were allowed to be involved in interfering with the welcome given to the Royal Heir to the British throne, namely, the Prince of Wales, when he was touring in British India.

Will the British Royalty, you British Statesmen and people, not overlook this blunder and let it be past history? Can we not bury what has happened and rise in mutual goodwill and understanding for the future? Let not then the hand of the clock be held back. Advance in full confidence that what you do for India will be repaid to you a thousandfold from the people who know how to respond to generous sentiments.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 37a

POSITION OF INDIANS OVERSEAS

And now I start on a voyage outside my country under the ægis of the British Flag. Under the protection it gave to its loyal citizens, Indians in search of wealth, adventurous people in search of enterprise, left their homes and their shores to find refuge in parts where freedom, justice and peace were symbolized in the trident of the Red, White and Blue.

Indians found their way to South Africa, to Canada, to New Zealand, Australia, and, I am not personally aware, but perhaps some of them to Newfoundland. They went as citizens under the Union Jack, established their homes, invested their money, and settled down as peaceful citizens of the Empire. I have been told, and perhaps rightly so, by General Smuts, that the idea of British cititzenship has changed from what it was a few years ago. I have forthwith applied myself to the facts, and asked the question, What does that mean? Surely the answer cannot be the treating of any particular race as outcasts. I am well aware of the fact that several of the questions with regard to Indians Overseas lie almost outside the direct concern of the Imperial Government. They are really within the purview of the self-governing Dominions, who are connected with the main centre by silken ties, and I will leave it at that. I want to address a few remarks directly to my Dominion colleagues.

And I will say this: One of your links in the chain is weak. If one link in it is weak and further weakened, perhaps you can do without it. That is your business. We, on our part, do not wish it. We want to have you with us. Let your inclinations decide. I know, my friends, how difficult it is for you to make any personal promises—for your positions depend, your authority depends on people to whom you are answerable. I assure you I appreciate the difficulty of your position. I, an Indian, have only tried to hold out my hand. I do not know if you and your people have the power and the desire to grasp it. Nothing hurts in the world more than the loss of "Izzat," humiliation. It is that one word which is the keynote of half the troubles of this world. It is certainly the keynote of the troubles of my country. Whether it is imaginary or real, Providence will judge, at least with open hearts shall we be able to approach Him, our Lord, on the Day of Judgment, and say, We are your children. It was all a game, it was all the chequer board of nights and days; we played our part, if it were ours for sacrifice, then we sacrificed that others might live.

Friends, I want to tell you that I have received messages from my country asking me that I should not work on the Conference, encouraging me to resign because India suffered humiliation in Natal and Kenya. But I paid no attention to these counsels of despair. It may perhaps be thought that I sought honour and glory, and could not forego such a lure as the Imperial Conference, but the reason that kept me here, rightly or wrongly, was because I felt that nothing in this world was achieved by ill-feeling, that a great deal if gained by toleration and goodwill. Come what may, I am determined to exercise them to the last in this assemblage.

I have received wails from the Fiji Islands, saying that the poll-tax was causing Indians grave injustice, and that they desired to be repatriated if no other gratification could be given to them. I have received tales of woe from Natal complaining that a law was going to be introduced segregating them as outcasts. Similar stories come from Basutoland and other places which I need not go on reciting. How all this sounds to your ears I do not know. How it sounds to mine is it necessary to speak? How it is going to affect India if these questions are not solved, is a prophecy that I shudder to make.

And, remember, my friends, that this question does not affect British India only, but our Indian States' subjects also are involved in this overseas problem. It is not alone a question that agitates the mind of British India, but it is one

that is viewed with equal humiliation in the Indian States. Why! I was surprised myself to receive letters from my own subjects, one or two sentences of which I will read out to you. I hope you will not mind the portions in which, out of affection and loyalty, personal references are made to me. This is certainly not the reason why I quote these sentences: "The Imperial Conference is drawing near. Your Highness is a member of that important assembly. India, bereft of all sympathy with the out-side world, has been passing her transitional days in trying circumstances, aggravated recently to a great extent by the Kenya decision."

Again: "Whether the movement means for India a political set-back or a real awakening and a sure progressing State, towards building up a great national edifice, remains to be seen, but at present she looks to Your Highness with wistful eyes."

KENYA SETTLEMENT

I say no more, and I regret having mentioned this portion of the letter. I have read the main portion of it to illustrate that the question is viewed with no less concern in one-third India than it is in two-thirds. I can give you innumerable instances, but I will not waste your time. The question of Indians in the Dominions is one that concerns the Dominion Premiers and their Parliaments primarily; but the question of Kenya as a Colony stands on an entirely different footing. I believe I am right when I say that many Indian settlers went to Kenya long before it was discovered as a suitable place for colonization by the white people. They took lands, invested money, and to a great extent helped in developing the prospects of that country economically. So long as the colony was administered by the Imperial Government, difficulties, I understand, did not arise until the question of franchise to the residents came under consideration. It has now been decreed in the last decision that the recent white settlers, who are in a minority, are to be given the majority of votes in relation to an Indian population, which is in majority—thus leaving the latter at the mercy of the former, to be gradually ousted, if necessary, and as seems possible, by means of legislation.

I do not mean to enter into the pros and cons of this case—what Lord Elgin said or Lord Milner recommended are side issues—because, from my own twenty years' experience of administration, I know how easy it is to produce arguments with all the power in one's hands and records and papers at one's disposal in favour of one case against another. Arguments would be an unwise course for me to adopt, for understandings are not always reached by arguments. I know that there are some noblemen and gentlemen of influence from this country who desire to settle there, if they have not already done so. But the principal argument that has been advanced is that the Colonial Office holds Kenya in trust on behalf of the African races, who are the original inhabitants of that country.

Now, if I may say so, it strikes me as being peculiarly grotesque that a country, held in trust on behalf of a people who are backward and have yet to grow under the ægis of the British flag, should actually have a franchise given to any one else to develop the country during the interregnum. Does this mean that, when the original tribes and people awaken from their slumber, they will be given primary consideration in relation to those who have invested money for several years past, and who govern the country, not under trust, but under a Franchise? I do not wish to enter into any further arguments. The whole question of Indians overseas seems to be one which does not mean the flooding of the different portions of the Empire with Indian immigrants claiming rights and privileges merely by their number in order to oust others who may have the rightful heritage. Mr. Mackenzie King, in one of his utterances in this

Conference, said, with regard to Canada, that it was possible to restrict immigration from Japan by mutual agreement, not necessitating the introduction of law. That was mutual right understanding which did not cause any humiliation on either side, and allowed the Dominions to grow in accordance with their own environments, yet at the same time made no strictures or asked no strictures to be passed on peoples who had settled there as peaceful citizens. I believe that the Indian Government—and I am open to correction if I am wrong—would be equally prepared to enter into mutual understanding with the various Dominions and Colonies to prevent immigrants from flooding these countries. Under such circumstances is it not possible to modify the laws and to enforce them in a manner that they do not pointedly chafe against any particular community, thus causing them humiliation? What I want to know is whether my countrymen, as citizens of the British Empire, have any rights to settle in these countries, not for exploitation, not by way of peaceful penetration, but as peaceful traders, to live their unobtrusive existence.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL SMUTS

General Smuts, in talking about the questions of Indians who come to his country, suggested, I think, in a casual way that they might be sent for settlement to British Guiana. I believe the British flag has been planted at the North Pole, so I wonder if that would not be a more suitable solution of the problem if it was desired to exterminate them. But I really came to know General Smuts after my brief knowledge of him, that, although he has been called—I am sorry to say—the arch-enemy of India, yet we have in him, if I may be permitted to say so to his face, a sagacious statesman who sees far ahead of ordinary mortals what is in the interests of our greater Empire. From my personal conversations with him I would reverse the epithet, and say that I regard him since I have come here—and I speak in no platitudes—in his heart of hearts, personally a staunch friend and supporter of India.

I may assure you, friends, that I quite appreciate the difficulties that exist in the solution of this great problem. I realize that, though individually most of you may be prepared to look at the matter from a broad Imperial view, you have to return to your Parliaments which may hold different opinions. All I have to say, therefore, is that, while we are conferring in this Imperial assemblage, can we not put our heads together to solve the difficulty which surely human beings were meant to solve, not for the sake of individuals, but for the sake of the Empire. I have said this much, because I feel that the problem is much greater than what appears on the surface relating merely to Indians overseas. If you can enable India by real action to feel that her humiliation is removed, that she can take pride in the Empire to which she has the privilege to belong, you will have achieved something which will be of lasting credit to yourselves and of benefit to the chain of which we all form a loyal link. Particularly since I have come here have I realized how whole-heartedly and with a single purpose Lord Reading and his Government have given their utmost help to our cause. Things do not always appear in public or in the Press which enable India to see what part the Government of India is playing in our cause. All glory, however, is due to them for their assistance. We shall not easily forget it, and hope that some day we may repay them for their effort and goodwill. Regarding Lord Peel, it is more difficult to give him thanks since he sits beside me. I thank him, however, in the name of India—if I may do so—and thank him with a grateful heart for his powerful championship of our cause he has indulged in to-day. My heart has been softened by the words he has spoken of our nationality and our religion. I hope every word of this state-

ment will go to India, so that my country may not despair that it has no one to support it. When the discussions take place, similarly, I hope the Prime Ministers of the Dominions will allow their goodwill and proposals to go to my country, for that I am sure will have a very happy result. I have very little more to say.

MESSAGE FROM PRINCES OF INDIA

Now, Prime Minister and Friends, it is my pleasurable task to read out a message that I received from my Order in India. His Highness the Chancellor of our Chamber, the Maharajah of Bikaner, has conveyed it to me by means of a cablegram. This is the message:—

> "Had the Chamber been sitting at this time, Indian princes would have desired to send a message to this Conference in view of the important question of Indians overseas, including Indian States' subjects who are affected specially in Kenya. But as the Chamber is not sitting the Princes of India by cablegram convey a cordial message of friendship and goodwill to His Majesty's Government, the British Nation, to the Dominions and Colonies and their distinguished representatives at the Imperial Conference, with whom the Princes are united by common ties of loyalty to His Imperial Majesty the King-Emperor."

The cable continues as follows:—

> "We give expression of our hope that the united efforts of all concerned at the Conference will yield some satisfactory result, drawing closely together into bonds of good fellowship the great comity of nations forming the British Empire to which the Princes and States are firmly attached, and securing the Indians, including the subjects of Indian States, an honoured position in all parts of the Empire in keeping with India's rightful place in the British Commonwealth and in conformity with the assiduous and constant efforts of His Excellency the Viceroy and the Government of India."

Friends, I convey this message to you coupled with my own hope that its aims and objects may be finally achieved before we leave England at the termination of the Imperial Conference.

The subject is undoubtedly large and certainly complicated, but surely with goodwill we will overcome difficulties, and, if, as we believe, we are firmly determined to see that every portion of the British Empire is strengthened, then I by no means despair; but on the other hand I hope for possibilities of arriving at a settlement which will make you all the more respected and loved in the eyes of those you help and will leave those grateful to you to whom you extend your hand in assistance. I hope that it will be possible for you to consider also whether it would not be advisable hereafter to allow India to be called a Dominion, not a self-governing Dominion until she becomes so, but a Dominion, specially when making reference to her in relation to her sister Dominions.

Gentlemen, I think I have said all that I wished to on the subject of my countrymen overseas on India's day. It has been a great pleasure to me to meet round this table great Statesmen who are my colleagues from the Dominions and to have the pleasure of making their personal acquaintance. May I thank them for their kindness and courtesy to myself which I take as a token of their goodwill for my country? If, at any time, any of my colleagues think of visiting India, I hope they will give us an opportunity of showing and proving that we do not always speak words but act on them, and that we can give you as cordial a welcome to our country as it is possible to do within our capacities.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 37a

GENERAL SMUTS WELCOMED TO INDIA

I said one day to my friend, General Smuts—and I speak sincerely and in no conventional language because he who was our enemy a few years ago is to-day one of our best friends and a great statesman of to-day—I said to him I hoped he would come some day to India and he replied that he would be viewed with suspicion. I hope India, with all her political quarrels and difficulties, has not lost her human touch and response to appreciate great statesmen and to prove to them that beyond our domestic disputes, beyond our domestic quarrels, lie the sentiments of humanity.

I believe, and I will with this conclude, that India came into the comity of nations within the British Empire with a definite purpose. It is a link that was soldered by the hand of Divine Destiny. It was a means of enabling the West to understand the East and *vice-versa*, but it also came in in order that the two civilizations with their spiritualities, with their material advancement and progress, might by their association together evolve a civilization, a great humanity of God's children playing their individual parts in the cause of God. When that day comes before us and, figuratively speaking, we stand before the Judgment Seat of Him who has sent us here, we shall each have our accounts to render. India may differ from you in race; she differs in religion and in creed, but she does not differ in point of humanity. Personally I say this: If you give us your assistance in time of need - for a friend in need is the friend in deed—we shall give you not only our gratitude but also our cordiality and practical assistance. But if it is destined to be otherwise, then I say this, that we shall be in a still higher position, for India will be able to say that she sacrificed herself in order that others might live; she prided herself in her political weakness in order that others may be strong; we gave our little best for the Higher purpose, for the Divine purpose which is our common goal—our common brotherhood and the salvation of humanity.

OCTOBER 29, 1923

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES

TRIBUTE TO PRESENTATION OF CASE FOR INDIA

The DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: At the outset of the few remarks I have to offer, I cannot refrain from saying that India has been exceedingly fortunate in the spokesmen selected to represent her case in this Conference.

That case, eloquently stated by Lord Peel and His Highness the Maharajah of Alwar, was developed by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru in a speech the closely reasoned argument of which was greatly reinforced by its studied moderation.

WHAT INDIA ASKS

I particularly noticed that the proposal which he submitted was outlined rather than reduced to the specific terms of a resolution. In this, if I may say so, I think he was very wise, because, while he made the general purport of his proposal perfectly clear, he left the precise form to be moulded in the subsequent discussion. Let me state as shortly as I can the gist of that proposal as I understood it. Two years ago this Conference, with the exception of the Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa, agreed that the rights of Indians domiciled in parts of the Empire other than India should be recognized. Sir

Tej now proposes that the question how and when effect can be given to this agreement should be made the subject of inquiry and discussion between committees representing the several Governments concerned and a committee representing the Government of India.

LIMITATION OF INDIAN REQUEST

That is what Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru asks. But before I proceed I must also invite you to note that there are various matters already settled which he is not attempting to reopen. He does not question the right of each community in the British Commonwealth to control the composition of its own population. He is not, in a word, asking the self-governing Dominions to reopen the question of Indian immigration. He frankly recognizes the autonomy of the Dominion Governments within their respective territories. What he asks is that the Governments concerned will agree to discuss with the Government of India the steps necessary to give effect to the resolution passed by the Conference in 1921. It is, of course, in the last instance for each Government to decide for itself, but, because in certain matters such decisions are not limited in their effects to the countries by which they are taken, the issues to which they relate may be brought for mutual discussion here.

BRITISH GOVERNMENT ACCEPTS PRINCIPLE OF REQUEST

In so far as the British Government is responsible for the Colonies and Protectorates, I can only say on behalf of the British Government that we certainly accept the principle of the request put forward by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru.

MAINTENANCE OF KENYA SETTLEMENT

In saying this you will not understand me to mean that we are prepared to reopen matters which have been made the subject of recent and most carefully considered decision. I refer more especially to the Kenya settlement, the terms of which were placed before and accepted by the British Parliament in July. While I would not propose that the area of discussion between the contemplated Committee and the Secretary of State for the Colonies should be limited, I should only be misleading India if I were to say anything to suggest that the Government could consent to reconsider the decisions embodied in the settlement of July last. To use the words of the White Paper, the constant endeavour of the British Government throughout their deliberations was to relate the principles which must govern the administration of a British Colony in Tropical Africa to the wider considerations of general Imperial Policy as enunciated in the Resolution of the Imperial Conference of 1921.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF BRITISH GOVERNMENT

I have also to remind the representatives of India that, so far as the British Colonies and Protectorates are concerned, the ultimate responsibility rests with the British Government, and it is with the British Government, and more particularly with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, that any questions affecting British Indians domiciled in these Colonies and Protectorates should be discussed in the first instance by such a Committee as Sir Tej has suggested. It will then be for the Colonial Office to consult, as may be necessary, any Colonial Government concerned with these discussions before any decisions are taken by the British Government.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 37a

POLITICAL STATUS OF INDIANS IN COLONIES, PROTECTORATES AND MANDATED TERRITORIES

I am hopeful that the area to be covered by these discussions will not in fact prove wide. I recently circulated to members of the Conference, in response to their general wish, a memorandum* upon the political status of British Indians in the Colonies, Protectorates and Mandated Territories. I studiously confined my memorandum to facts, and perhaps I may be permitted to summarize quite briefly what that memorandum contains.

It shows that, in the West Indian Colonies, British Indians are under no political or legal disability of any kind. They have the same franchise and the same opportunities of becoming members of elective bodies as any other British subjects. The West Indian Colonies in which there is a considerable British-Indian population are British Guiana, Trinidad and Jamaica. In British Guiana and Jamaica the elective system already exists, and it will be introduced in Trinidad at an early date.

When you turn to the Eastern Colonies the memorandum shows that in Ceylon, under a revised Constitution about to be issued, qualified British Indians will be eligible for the franchise and for election to the Legislative Council in the same manner as all other British subjects. Again, in Mauritius there is no distinction between British Indians and other British subjects as regards eligibility for the franchise.

In East Africa you will find from the memorandum that in Uganda the Legislative Council is not elective, but that there is no restriction on the number or race of the unofficial members who may be nominated to the Council, while in Tanganyika Territory there is no Legislative or Executive Council.

Subject to a clear understanding on these points, my colleagues and I cordially welcome on behalf of the British Government the proposal of the representatives of India so far as the Colonies and Protectorates are concerned.

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

CANADA'S ATTITUDE OF GOODWILL

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would like to say that I think Canada fully appreciates the magnitude and seriousness of the problem with which the Government of India and the Government of Britain are confronted in dealing with any question affecting the status of Indians, and that our attitude from the beginning has been, and at present is, one of being exceedingly anxious to be helpful in the solution of any problem that may arise. His Highness the Maharajah, in speaking last week, referred to the manner in which we had recently taken up by conference some question respecting Immigration with Japan, and he said that, in his opinion, any of these questions of status and political rights respecting resident Indians could be best settled by adopting a similar method. He referred particularly to an attitude of goodwill being more important than anything else in the solution of these difficult questions. I think the Maharajah is entirely right. Attitude in these matters is all-important; so far as the Canadian attitude is concerned, it gives me pleasure to say that we are most anxious to deal with this whole question in a spirit of mutual understanding and goodwill.

---

*See page 136.

RECENT HISTORY OF INDIAN IMMIGRATION QUESTION

I have in my hand a Report* that I made to the Government of Canada in 1908. It relates to Immigration to Canada from the Orient, and Immigration from India in particular. It was the result of a visit which, at the instance of the Government of the day in Canada, I paid to England to confer with the Secretary of State for India in regard to the question of Immigration from India to Canada. If I may be permitted, I would like to read the concluding paragraph of this Report, because it sets out the attitude of that time—fifteen years ago—which we took towards questions affecting our fellow British citizens from India:—

> "Nothing could be more unfortunate or misleading than that the impression should go forth that Canada, in seeking to regulate a matter of domestic concern, is not deeply sensible of the obligations which citizenship within the Empire entails. It is a recognition of this obligation which has caused her to adopt a course which, by removing the possibilities of injustice and friction, is best calculated to strengthen the bonds of association with the several parts, and to promote the greater harmony of the whole. In this, as was to be expected, Canada has had not only the sympathy and understanding, but the hearty co-operation of the authorities in Great Britain and India as well."

I should say, perhaps, that, after conferring with the Secretary of State for India in London at that time in regard to this question, I subsequently, at the instance of the Canadian Government, went to India to take up with the authorities there the question of the migration of Indians to Canada with a view of seeing whether we could not work out a solution which would avoid anything in the nature of legislation which might be misunderstood or regarded as invidious in India, and I am happy to say that we were able, as a result of conferences, to come to an understanding between the two Governments which was as satisfactory to the Government of India as it was to the Government of Canada. If it was possible to do that in regard to the difficult question of Immigration, I think it ought to be possible for us similarly to effect a satisfactory solution with respect to any of these other questions that may arise, and it is from that point of view that I hope my colleagues from India will feel that the Canadian Government is approaching this particular subject.

POSITION OF INDIANS DOMICILED IN CANADA

Lord Peel in his remarks said, I think, very rightly, that what the Indians felt more than anything else was that the disabilities under which their countrymen live appear as a brand of social inferiority. The extent to which that is true depends very largely upon the nature of the disabilities and the circumstances which account for any that may exist.

NO DISABILITIES IN EIGHT PROVINCES. SOME POLITICAL DISABILITY IN ONE

May I say at once in regard to Canada that, in eight of the Provinces out of nine which comprise the Dominion, I am not aware of any legal or political disability under which any Indian resident in Canada suffers, and, with respect to the ninth Province, I am not aware of any legal disability of any kind; I am only aware of a political disability in the matter of the exercise of the franchise in that one Province, and that not as regards all Indians, because, as respects all Provinces, including British Columbia, the one exception I have mentioned, the Federal Law relating to the franchise sets it down that any

---

*See Canadian Sessional Paper No. 36A of 1908.

Indian who served with His Majesty's Forces—Military, Naval or Air—is entitled to the franchise. I mention this as evidence of the fact that our citizens appreciate the services that India has rendered the Empire and desire to acknowledge them wherever possible.

HISTORY OF CANADIAN FRANCHISE

May I say a word as to the way our franchise has been developed? The Dominion is the result of the bringing together of a number of Provinces, and the Party to which I belong—the Liberal Party in Canada—has taken a position that, wherever it was possible to recognize the wishes of a Province in matters pertaining to the franchise, regard to such should be had. For that reason our Federal Franchise Act for many years recognized for Federal purposes only the franchise prevailing in the Province. We had not a separate franchise for the Dominion. We took, for the Dominion, the provincial franchise as it existed, with the result that in some Provinces some classes had the right to vote who had not the right to vote in others, not on account of race, but owing solely to the fact that for their own reasons certain of the Provinces had thought it well to limit the franchise in certain particulars. The late Government, which represented an opposite view in some particulars, changed somewhat the Franchise Law a few years ago, and endeavoured to enact a Federal Franchise which would be applicable generally throughout the Dominion. They provided that women, for example, should have the right to vote in Federal matters. Those of us who had held to a recognition of provincial enactments opposed that attitude. We said it should still be left to the Provinces to determine as respects the franchise to be given women, as in all else, what they thought best. However, the Government at that time did carry a provision which made the law in this matter of the exercise of the franchise by women generally applicable. Notwithstanding, that very Government, having regard for the conditions in the Province of British Columbia, in order to avoid a serious situation arising there which might have been misunderstood in other parts of the Empire, found it necessary as regards certain of the provisions affecting the Federal Franchises in the cases of British Columbia to make an exception to this general application. I mention this because it discloses how in one Province a particular question may become a burning political issue. For the Federal Government to try and deal with it in a manner which would be regarded as coercing any Province would give rise to an entirely new question. For example, if the Federal Government had tried in respect of all persons resident there to impose on the Province of British Columbia certain obligations, such, for example, as the right to vote under the Federal franchise, the issue would not in public discussion have been a question of the franchise at all; it would have been a question of coercion by the Federal Government of a Provincial Government, and you would have had a political battle fought on the basis of what we speak of as "provincial rights." I am sure all at this table will appreciate that that kind of political conflict is one of the most dangerous a country can be faced with. It is as though Britain were to try and impose certain obligations on Canada or some other part of the Empire. In dealing with the Provinces we of the Federal Government seek, as far as we can, to prevent anything in the way of coercion. I think it is as well to mention this because it helps to explain why in one Province it has not been possible, up to the present, to concede the franchise to the Indians who are there.

QUESTION BEST DEALT WITH ON RECIPROCAL LINES

As to how Canada's action may be viewed in India, it seems to me to be very much a matter of interpretation, and the spirit of interpretation. I

could go to India and say with truth, that every citizen coming from the State over which His Highness the Maharajah of Alwar rules has rights of citizenship in my Province which I have not in his. That is a point which cannot be brought out too clearly. In eight Provinces out of nine in Canada every Indian resident there has the same right as other Canadian citizens, but that is not equally true of Canadians resident in India. If this aspect is put before the people of India they will see that the reciprocal method of dealing with this question, as pointed out by General Smuts, is one which perhaps presents the line along with which we can proceed most satisfactorily. So far as Canada is concerned, we would not ask for our citizens resident in India any right which we are not prepared equally to concede to Indians resident in Canada. I think you may take that as the fundamental basis on which we would be prepared to deal with this question; we hold to this reciprocal point of view because in all things we have found it to be one of the most satisfactory methods of dealing with questions of this kind.

PROBLEM IN BRITISH COLUMBIA AN ECONOMIC ONE

So far as British Columbia is concerned the problem is not a racial one; it is purely an economic problem. The Labour forces in British Columbia are very strong. That Province has had industrial problems of a character which no other Province in the Dominion has had and what the Labour people are aiming at is, I think, to maintain certain industrial standards which they had sacrificed much to acquire. As respects some of those who have come from other countries they are rather fearful, until at least they have resided for some time in Canada and have acquired our method of living, our customs, habits, and so forth, that to give them the rights of franchise in full may mean that the standard already maintained may be undermined. I would like to make this clear.

POSSIBLE POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF GIVING FRANCHISE TO INDIANS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

It may seem I am straining a little in emphasizing the possible political consequence of giving the franchise to resident Indians in British Columbia.

But take the actual situation as it is in Parliament to-day. When we came into office, I had a majority of one behind me in the House of Commons. I think we have a majority of three at the present time. Many of the constituencies were very close. It is conceivable that in British Columbia the difference in the result might be material by increasing a certain vote in some of the constituencies. In other words, were the subject to become one of political discussion, I think it would be possible for a political orator to make it quite apparent to the people of British Columbia that the fate of the Federal Government might depend upon the vote cast by the Indians resident in that Province. It would not be an exaggeration, it would not be a figure of speech; it is a literal and absolute truth. It is conceivable that the complexion of Parliament as it is to-day might be entirely changed. The consequence might be that one Government rather than another would be in office by the vote of those who, either in their own country nor in Canada, have ever exercised the franchise. That is the situation which exists at the moment. I do not expect it will exist very long, but it all helps to show the difficulty which we are confronted with when we contemplate, in any immediate way, results which we all hope will be effected in the course of time. It is for that, among other reasons, that I appreciate the method of approach which Sir Tej has adopted in bringing his suggestion before this Conference. He has appreciated, I think, our difficulties as well as his own, and, in suggesting there could be

a Conference between representatives of India and representatives of Canada, I think he has had in mind enabling the citizens of India to appreciate just the kind of circumstances which have governed our actions quite as much as having our citizens appreciate his difficulties. That is the sort of approach and attitude which permits us to get together and I should be surprised if, dealing with this question in that spirit, we could not work out a thoroughly satisfactory solution.

INTERPRETATION OF 1921 RESOLUTION

There is one point I ought to make quite clear and that is the extent to which my hands are tied in dealing with this question. The resolution* which was passed at this Conference two years ago in the minds of some present committed the Dominions to giving the franchise to the Indians. It was, they allege, in the nature of a general commitment. It is all important that we should know whether that was the intention of the resolution or not. I think in the first place we should be very careful of resolutions that are introduced or passed, and I think, when once they are passed, we should do our utmost to see that any hopes to which they may give rise are not destroyed. In the House of Commons I asked my predecessor, Mr. Meighen, what his interpretation was of the resolution of 1921. I have before me the "Hansard" of the 29th June of this year,† which contains the record, and with the permission of the Conference I shall read from it:—

> "Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my right honourable friend one question? The resolution of the Conference, or at least one clause of it, is as follows:—
>
> "The Conference accordingly is of the opinion that in the interests of the solidarity of the British Commonwealth it is desirable that the rights of such Indians to citizenship should be recognized."
>
> "The Honourable Member for George Etienne Cartier, Mr. Jacobs, has said that these words imply an undertaking on the part of this Parliament, or rather on the part of Canada, to see that the federal franchise is granted to the Indians in British Columbia. Is that correct or not?
>
> Mr. MEIGHEN: The words are English and the words are simple. I understand them fully and if the Prime Minister does not I must leave him just where he is.
>
> Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the House is entitled to an answer from my right honourable friend. He represented this country at the Imperial Conference. He knows better than anyone else what interpretation he placed on these words. I ask him, seeing that he represented Canada at the Imperial Conference when that resolution was passed, whether he understood that Canada was giving an undertaking to the Indians in British Columbia to the effect that they should be entitled to the franchise.
>
> "Mr. MEIGHEN: No human being understood anything of the sort. The words are very plain and there is no misunderstanding them."

I should be taken very seriously to task if, when I returned to Canada, it could be said that I had placed an interpretation on that resolution which the Prime Minister of Canada who was present at the time it was passed was unwilling to have placed upon it. I think Mr. Meighen has taken his attitude

---

*See page 9 of Cmd. 1474.

†See page 4815 of Official Report, House of Commons Debates, Canada, 1923.

from the words: "It is desirable that the rights of such Indians to citizenship should be recognized." If that means we would all like to see it done, that we hope it may be done, I think I can agree with him in this expression of such a wish. On the other hand, as to its constituting an actual pledge, I am bound to take the interpretation which Mr. Meighen himself gives and places upon it. I should, perhaps, say that I presented that point of view to Mr. Sastri when he was in Canada and my recollection is that Mr. Sastri did not maintain that the resolution constituted a pledge which obliged the Federal Government to give the franchise to resident Indians but rather that it expressed what the Conference hoped would be done by the different Dominions as opportunity offered.

MR. SASTRI'S VISIT

May I say just a word in regard to Mr. Sastri's visit? We were pleased to welcome Mr. Sastri to Canada and we sought to give him the fullest opportunity to speak publicly wherever he wished to do so in the Dominion, to confer with any persons whom he might wish to meet, and we were glad to have him in conference with us in the Cabinet so that we could explain very fully all the considerations of which we had to take account. I think Mr. Sastri appreciated our situation the better in view of having seen conditions for himself and having talked with many persons in different parts of the Dominion.

MATTER WILL BE CONSIDERED WHEN FRANCHISE LAW REVISED

I cannot do better in setting forth our Governments attitude than to read to the Conference and place on record the letter I wrote to Mr. Sastri just as he was leaving our Dominion. It is dated Ottawa, the 5th September, 1922, and is as follows:—

"The Right Hon. V. Srinivasa Sastri,
"Chateau Laurier, Ottawa.
"Dear Mr. Sastri,—

"In reply to the representations made by you at the interview with my colleagues and myself on Friday of last week, and which were the subject of further conference between us yesterday, I desire to assure you that, at the earliest favourable moment, the Government will be pleased to invite the consideration of Parliament to your request that natives of India resident in Canada be granted a Dominion parliamentary franchise on terms and conditions identical with those which govern the exercise of that right by Canadian citizens generally.

"The subject is necessarily one which Parliament alone can determine. It will be submitted to Parliament for consideration when the franchise law is under revision.

"In conveying to the Government of India an expression of the attitude of the Government of Canada in this matter, we hope that you will not fail to make it clear that at the present time, in eight of the nine provinces of which our Dominion is composed, the federal franchise is granted to natives of India resident in Canada, on terms which are identical with those applicable generally to Canadian citizens.

"Yours sincerely,

"W. L. Mackenzie King."

You will observe that we have promised Mr. Sastri that when our Federal Franchise Law comes up for revision we will take care to see that Parliament is fully informed of his representations and wishes, and we will seek to have those representations and wishes given every consideration. It is probable that

the Dominion Franchise Act will come up for revision at the approaching Session of Parliament. I told Mr. Sastri it was hardly probable it would come up last Session, but that I thought it would come up next Session. If the course we anticipate is followed, the Franchise Act will be referred to a Committee of the House, and that Committee will be in a position to hear any representations that may be made to it.

IF COMMITTEE FROM INDIA SENT TO CANADA, IT WILL BE GIVEN EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO DICUSS QUESTION

My friends from India will have to decide for themselves what is likely to be most in their own interests in the matter of having a Committee visit Canada and take up this matter anew. I say that for the reason that I am not so sure that Mr. Sastri's visit has made it easier for us to deal with this problem. I would put it in this way. Mr. Sastri's visit helped to direct the attention of the country to something which I imagine the greater part of the country did not know anything about. I doubt if the majority of the people in Canada were aware that in the Province of British Columbia, for example, the Indians did not have the franchise. They may have known in the other Provinces that they had the franchise, but the question of the few in British Columbia not having the franchise would hardly be known to any extent outside that Province. Once, however, Mr. Sastri began delivering his speeches the Labour Council from one end of the country to the other began to receive communications from Labour Organizations in British Columbia asking them to take care to see that such standards as labour had won in British Columbia were maintained. The forces that were opposed to granting the franchise to Indians became organized in a way they had not been before. Whether that same result might follow the visit of a deputation from India I cannot say. It might or it might not, but, should our friends from India think it would help them to have a delegation come to Canada to confer on the subject, we shall be most happy to appoint a corresponding group to meet and confer with them. If it were their desire to have their delegation given an opportunity of meeting the Parliamentary Committee to which the matter will be referred for consideration, I should be glad to see, if the time of their visit so permitted, that they were given a chance to meet the members of that Committee and to confer with them at Ottawa. In other words, we would be only too happy to give to any group which may come from India, any person she may send, the amplest opportunities to discuss with our public men all aspects of this particular question. I say this having regard to the method of approach Sir Tej has presented to us here. He has made it clear that the Committee would come for the purpose of exploring avenues and ways and means to reach an ultimate result. He should recognize that we may have to take time in this matter, but I would like him to believe that we are sincere in hoping that we will be able to meet his wishes. In seeking so to do, we may have to proceed step by step, but the Canadian people as a whole are, I am sure, really desirious of meeting our fellow British citizens from India in every reasonable particular. I have not the slightest doubt about that.

PROGRESS OF INDIA TOWARDS SELF-GOVERNMENT

Perhaps I may be permitted to say just one word in conclusion. Sir Tej spoke very feelingly the other day about political freedom and the desires of India in the matter of self-government. When I was in India I heard a good deal of the discussion that was going on. Let me say that I have a natural sympathy with the desires of a people to have the right to manage their own affairs. Were I a citizen of India, and this is what I felt most at that time, I

should feel above everything else that in India being a part of the British Empire there lay the surest guarantee that this desire for self-government will be realized in the course of time in the manner which to India herself will be most effective and helpful. It is inconceivable that the opinions represented at this table, the views of the different Dominions represented here, should not accord with aspirations of self-government. There is this, however, which I think we have to remember and which those of us in the Dominions have had occasion to realize, that our Dominions have been peopled largely by citizens who have come out from the British Isles, and that those who have been most active in effecting reforms have themselves come with ideals which it had taken their ancestors many, many years to work out in this old land. Our struggle for responsible government in the Dominions was largely a continuation of the long struggle of several centuries which had taken place in the British Isles, and I think the evolution of self-government in the Dominions has become what it is largely because of the long process of political training through which in previous years the peoples of the British Isles had passed. For that reason I hope that our friends in India will appreciate that here again time may be a helpful factor in the working out of what, in the long run, in the interests of India herself will be the surest and the best guide to complete self-government.

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

TRIBUTE TO PRESENTATION OF CASE FOR INDIA

Mr. Bruce: Prime Minister, I would like to preface the few remarks I wish to make by congratulating the representatives of India on the very eloquent and temperate manner in which they stated the case which they have to present.

ATTITUDE OF AUSTRALIA TO RESOLUTIONS OF PREVIOUS CONFERENCES

This question is not one which vitally affects Australia as it does South Africa. I desire, however, to refer to the Resolution on the position of Indians in the Empire which was adopted by the Conference of 1921. The resolution commenced by reaffirming the previous Resolution of 1918, that the government of each community of the British Commonwealth should enjoy complete control of the composition of its own population by means of restriction on immigration from any of the other communities. It then went on to recognize that there is an incongruity between India's position as an equal member of the British Empire and the existence of disabilities upon British Indians lawfully domiciled in some other parts of the Empire. The resolution recorded the opinion that, in the interests of the solidarity of the British Empire, it is desirable to recognize the rights of such lawfully domiciled Indians to citizenship in their countries of domicile. This resolution was concurred in by the representatives of Australia.

SYMPATHY WITH INDIANS DOMICILED IN AUSTRALIA

The object of the representatives of India at this Conference in bringing forward the question of the status of Indians is, as I understand, to further the investigation of the question of the means of giving practical effect to that part of the resolution which refers to the recognition of rights of citizenship of Indians lawfully domiciled in other parts of the Empire. As far as Australia is concerned, this question has been the subject of considerable public discussion,

and the representatives of every shade of political thought have shown sympathy with the claim that lawfully domiciled Indians should enjoy full citizen rights. As the question did not figure in the preliminary agenda of the Conference, I have not had the opportunity of consulting my colleagues or my Parliament upon it. I believe, however, that Australian public opinion is ready to welcome, so far as the position of Indians domiciled in Australia is concerned, any measure which is conceived in the interests of the Empire as a whole. The number of Indians in Australia is small—there are only 2,000 of them—so that from the purely Australian point of view the problem is a small one, but it is recognized that this is part of a larger Imperial problem.

NO CHANGE IN COMMONWEALTH IMMIGRATION POLICY

It is not a question of admitting fresh Indians within our territory. That would be contrary to the fundamental principles which animate the people of Australia and must govern the policy of any Australian Government; nor, as I fully understand, is there the slightest shadow of a suggestion that the immigration of Indians into Australia is desired by the Government or by the people of India. It is simply a question of satisfying the legitimate aspirations of the few Indians who are already lawfully domiciled in our midst, and contributing by this action to the solution of an Imperial problem, by the removal of anomalies which, as I understand, are felt very keenly in India in view of her new status as an integral part of the Imperial Commonwealth.

TRIBUTE TO INDIA'S PLACE IN EMPIRE, AND TO HER CIVILIZATION

India is no longer a mere Dependency, but one of the component members of the British Commonwealth of Nations. We have the greatest admiration of the efforts put forth by India in the late war, by which she won her new status. I need only refer to her contributions in men, money and material, her recruitment on a voluntary basis of something like 1½ million men, the services which her army rendered by sending more than a million Indian troops overseas to all the theatres of war, and her free gift to the Imperial Exchequer, which added, as I am told, over 30 per cent to her national debt at that time. Apart from these material aids, the moral value of the part played by India in the war cannot be over-estimated. The vast masses of the Indian people have always been conspicuous for their loyalty to the British Throne, and their wholehearted and voluntary participation in the world conflict undoubtedly afforded striking proof of this to both foes and friends alike. Even apart from that welcome evidence that in its hour of need the Empire may rely on India as a strength and support, instead of a source of weakness as our late enemies dared to hope, I wish to emphasize that the people of Australia have always had the greatest respect for India's traditions and culture, her literature and her arts, her attainments in the world of thought and her achievements in action—in a word, for her civilization, which, while reposing on such ancient foundations, has, at the same time, shown itself capable of progress and adaptation to the needs of the modern world. That civilization is not identical with ours; it is older, and it is the civilization of the East rather than of the West; capable, however, as India has already shown, of absorbing what is valuable in Western civilization, just as the West, in its turn, has lessons to learn from the civilization that is characteristic of India.

INDIAN PROBLEM RESULTS FROM CONFLICT OF ECONOMIC STANDARDS

Nor is the established policy of maintaining the European character of our population and not permitting the immigration of Asiatic settlers in conflict with

such an appreciation. It is not a policy founded on feelings of race or colour, but it is motived by economic considerations which appear to us to be clear and cogent. I have said that the civilization of the East, though older and possibly in some respects superior, is different from that of the West, and among other things this implies a well-marked difference of economic standards. Asiatic immigrants would be able to work and support life with what, to them, would represent a high degree of comfort, under conditions and for wages which would make it impossible for workers of European descent, accustomed to European standards, to compete with them. If, therefore, Asiatic immigrants were admitted, it would be impossible to provide employment for Europeans. They would inevitably be ousted from the labour market, and our population, and with it our institutions and our civilizations, would gradually lose their original European character which we are naturally determined to do all in our power to preserve. It is for this reason that the Commonwealth Parliament has passed enactments which effectively prohibit the immigration of Indian or other Asiatic settlers or labourers, and it is for this reason that we welcomed the Resolution of 1918, reaffirmed in 1921, by which the Imperial Conference has recognized the right of each Government to control the composition of the population of its country by means of restriction on immigration from the other communities of the Empire.

ATTITUDE OF AUSTRALIA IS SYMPATHETIC, BUT NO NEED FOR COMMITTEE

That Resolution was accepted by India, and the Government of India have never swerved in their loyal acquiescence and co-operation with us in our policy. But, viewing the relations of India with the other parts of the Empire as an Imperial problem, we appreciate that the maintenance of the immigration policy is only one side of the question. On the other side we have the desire of India to see the grant of political and other rights of citizenship accorded to her sons who have already, and in some cases for many years past, been legitimately domiciled within Australia. This desire is largely satisfied in the principle of the Resolution of 1921. That Resolution, together with the Resolution of 1918, must be regarded as interdependent parts of a single endeavour to promote harmonious relations between the Dominions and India by securing the immigration policy of the former on the one hand and by removing the cause of any ill-feeling in India on the other. The object of both Resolutions, as I regard them, is to foster the cohesion of the Empire as a single unit, not only comprehending within itself certain communities of European race all inspired by Western ideals of civilization, but also uniting in one system the different ideals, elements of strength and potentialities of progress towards the common good which the Empire is happily able to draw from Eastern as well as from Western sources.

In view of the position which exists in Australia and the consideration which has been given to the question, there is no necessity for a Committee further to discuss the matter such as has been suggested by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru. While I appreciate the spirit in which it is put forward, I do not think, in the special circumstances of Australia, there is any necessity for such action. On my return to Australia I will consult with my colleagues as to what action can be taken.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 37a

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF NEW ZEALAND

TRIBUTE TO PRESENTATION OF CASE FOR INDIA

Mr. MASSEY: I will only detain the Conference a very few minutes. I should like—and I have no doubt the other members of the Conference feel as I do—I should like to express my appreciation of the eloquent speeches delivered by the representatives of India. I am especially impressed by the fact, which was very evident, that, while they were insistent in looking after the interests of India, they spoke as patriotic British citizens. I do not think there will be very much difficulty in the plan I am thinking now of the proposal that Committees representing the Dominions should meet a Committee representing India. I am speaking more particularly for my own country

POSITION OF INDIANS IN NEW ZEALAND

I would like to endorse that, so far as New Zealand is concerned, we are practically giving the natives of India resident in New Zealand the same privileges which are enjoyed by people of the Anglo-Saxon race who are settled there. There is practically no difference between them. If there is or ever has been at any time any objection to natives of India coming to New Zealand, those objections have been raised for economic reasons such as have been referred to by the Prime Minister of Australia. The workers in New Zealand are naturally anxious to maintain the present standard of living, and if there happened to be a large influx of natives of India at any time they have an idea that such standard might become lowered. They are naturally anxious and I am bound to say the New Zealand Parliament is also anxious—to prevent anything of the sort happening. There is no such thing as race-prejudice or anything of that sort. So far as the aboriginal natives of New Zealand are concerned they are in exactly the same position as the European residents in New Zealand; they have the same privileges in regard to Parliament and in connection with local affairs.

STATUS OF INDIA AT IMPERIAL CONFERENCE

I have heard it stated as a matter of fact that there is an impression in India that the representatives of the Indian Empire at the Imperial Conference do not occupy the same position as the representatives of the Dominions or other parts of the Empire. Now I think that ought to be contradicted emphatically. We who represent the Dominions—and I know I can speak for those who represent the United Kingdom and the Colonies as well—are anxious that the representatives of India sitting round this historic table should enjoy all the privileges that we enjoy and should have exactly the same position. I think that ought to be made perfectly clear in India.

METHODS OF AGITATION IN INDIA

I know this, that India has become during recent years a fruitful hunting ground for agitators; I am not thinking of Indian agitators when I say that, because I know—and it is nothing to be proud of—that some of the people of our own race have taken a promient part in fomenting trouble in India, and not only in India, but in those British countries where a number of natives of India have become located. There are not many opportunities in my country, but I have known people of our own race to be doing their level best to stir up trouble with the natives of India. Fiji is our neighbour and there is a large number of Indians there. I am not speaking for Fiji, but I would only say this, that I have the best of reasons for knowing—I know it officially—that Europeans

frequently have been doing their level best to foment disturbances in Fiji. I am simply speaking of labour troubles and difficulties of that sort. Once troubles are started and when strikes take place we, who have had experience of these indu-trial troubles, never know where they are going to end; and they sometimes stir up trouble which is not forgotten for a very long time afterwards.

TRIBUTE TO INDIA'S PLACE IN EMPIRE, AND TO HER CIVILIZATION

My opinion—I speak as a British citizen and not only as the representative of New Zealand—is that we should do everything that is possible to make the natives of India feel, whether here or in India itself, that we want to treat them with justice, and that we want to do everything that is fair and right and proper as far as they are concerned. I know perfectly well that when we think of government by Indians we have to remember—and I think it was the Maharajah who expressed his opinion—that if development is to take place it will not be quite by what is called Western methods. We can understand that. When one remembers the huge population of India, the number of races which are there, the number of languages that are spoken, and the different religions, I have often thought that it might be desirable, when the time comes, as I believe it will come, to let India be divided into a number of Dominions rather than to remain one State or Empire as it is at present. I have not been to India, and I only look at it from the outside. The European residents in India, and the representatives of India themselves, know very much better than I do what will be necessary in time to come to enable Indians to attain the position they desire to occupy. I was very much struck with the concluding remarks of Lord Peel, and I have not forgotten that when the destinies of the British Empire were trembling in the balance there was no hesitation on the part of India to do her duty; I will not say "to come to its assistance," because when they were fighting for the Empire they were fighting for themselves as citizens of the Empire. They undoubtedly did their duty in a way which was admired in every part of the Empire and by every one of its races. The Prime Minister of Australia has mentioned the number of men who were sent and the amount of money contributed by the Indian Empire itself, and on that account I am quite sure the representatives and the patriotic British citizens, to whichever part of the Empire they belong, will always be desirous of upholding the wishes of the people of India and of assisting in the development which they so ardently desire. I do not know whether it can be done for some time or not; probably hurrying up matters might do more harm than good.

NEW ZEALAND STANDS BY PREVIOUS RESOLUTIONS

So far as the Committees are concerned, when Mr. Sastri was in New Zealand he had an opportunity of meeting both branches of the Legislature and an opportunity of saying everything he chose to say to them. He said that, so far as New Zealand was concerned, he then had practically no fault to find. I hope later on that the same thing may be said of the residents in other parts of the Empire. I was present, of course, when the original arrangement was made in 1918; I was present when it was reaffirmed in 1921; and by that we desire to stand. If any improvements can be suggested with regard to what is in operation at present, I have not the slightest doubt but that the representatives of the Dominions and the other representatives of the British Empire here will consider them. I do not know whether anything of the sort is intended at present, but I want to assure the representatives of India that so far as they are concerned there is no desire to keep them in the background, but to give them all the privileges that British citizens in other parts of the Empire enjoy.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 37a

I should like to say that I do not intend to interfere in the matter of Kenya. The position in South Africa stands by itself and I am not able to judge of it. I only say that I should like to do anything I possibly can to bring about a better understanding between the two races in South Africa, those representative of the European race and those representative of the Indians. If we can do anything at all we shall be only too glad to do it.

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

TRIBUTE TO PRESENTATION OF CASE FOR INDIA

General Smuts: I desire to pay my tribute also to the earnestness, the eloquence, and the ability of the speeches that have been made here by the representatives of India. The proposal which has been made by Sir Tej Sapru does not concern South Africa, and therefore I do not think it is necessary for me to detain the Conference at any length. As, however, the subject is a very difficult one I may perhaps be allowed to say a few words in reference to the general situation.

MR. SASTRI'S MISSION HAS MADE SOLUTION OF PROBLEM MORE DIFFICULT

The Maharajah has said, very rightly, that what this question requires is understanding—understanding not only of the difficulties and the special position of India, but also of the difficulties and the special position of other British communities; and I think a few words of mine might not be out of place here. So far as I can judge, the atmosphere has really become worse in the last two years for a solution of this question. In South Africa, undoubtedly, it has become worse. That is due partly to the visit of Mr. Sastri and his speeches in various parts of the Empire, to which I do not wish to refer with any particularity. The Prime Minister of Canada has said what the effect of the visit has been in Canada, and in South Africa it has undoubtedly emphasized the difficulties that existed before. That was one of the reasons why I thought it might not be wise for Mr. Sastri to come to South Africa. Our difficulties are great enough as they are.

SOUTH AFRICAN ATTITUDE TO INDIAN PROBLEM IN KENYA

There was another circumstance which has affected the attitude and the atmosphere in South Africa very considerably, and that is the Kenya question. There is no doubt that in South Africa a profound sympathy was stirred up for Kenya. Here you have a very small British community, a handful of settlers, who find themselves pitted against the mighty Empire of India, who find themselves against overwhelming forces, and who, although they are the most loyal community in the British Empire, consisting mostly of ex-Army men, had in the end to go to the length of almost threatening force in order to maintain their position. The sympathy that was aroused and stirred for Kenya in South Africa has had a very serious repercussion there on the Indian question as a whole. I have no fault whatever to find with the attitude of either the Colonial Office or the India Office here. I have nothing but praise for the way they handled this very difficult situation, and the settlement that was come to was, I think, a wise compromise, and so far as my influence went I used it with the people of Kenya to get them to accept the settlement, as they have accepted it. But I must say, quite frankly, that I have been very much perturbed over

the attitude adopted by the Indian Government in this matter. They pressed the case against Kenya in a way which seemed to me to exceed the limits of prudence and wisdom, and when the settlement was ultimately made language was used in regard to it which I think would certainly not help the case of loyalty either in India or anywhere else in the Empire. The whole incident, as I say, has had a very bad effect in South Africa.

POSITION IN SOUTH AFRICA ITSELF

The difficulties from the African point of view are very great. Sir Tej has said and quite rightly that the majority of the population of the British Empire are coloured. That is so. But let me make this remark: all through the very able and moderate argument of Sir Tej he referred to this colour question and the indignity which was either openly or by inference inflicted on those British subjects who have colour. Well, I wish to say that, so far as we in South Africa are concerned, it is not a question of colour, it is a different principle that is involved.

QUESTION NOT ONE OF COLOUR BUT OF ECONOMIC COMPETITION

I think that every thinking man in South Africa takes the attitude, not that the Indian is inferior to us because of his colour or on any other ground—he may be our superior; it is the case of a small civilization, a small community, finding itself in danger of being overwhelmed by a much older and more powerful civilization and it is the economic competition from people who have entirely different standards and viewpoints from ourselves. From the African point of view, what is the real difficulty? You have a continent inhabited by 100 million blacks, where a few small white communities have settled down as the pioneers of European civilization. You cannot blame these pioneers, these very small communities, in South Africa and in Central Africa if they put up every possible fight for the civilization which they started, their own European civilization. They are not there to foster Indian civilization, they are there to foster Western civilization, and they regard as a very serious matter anything that menaces their position, which is already endangered by the many difficulties which surround them in Africa. In south Africa, our position in a nutshell is as follows: In the Union, we have a native population of over 6 million; we have a white population of over 1½ million; we have an Indian population of something like 160,000, mostly confined to one Province, to the most British Province in the Union, the Province of Natal.

PARTICULARLY IN NATAL

Mr. Sastri, in one of his somewhat outrageous statements, referred to this as a Boer Empire, an empire which is swamped by Boer ideals. Well, the fact is that the Indian difficulties have mostly arisen, and continue to grow, in a part of South Africa where there are almost no Boers at all, in an almost purely British community; but you have in this Province of Natal a majority of Indians and a minority of British settlers, and, whatever the mistakes of the past may have been, the grandchildren of to-day do not plead guilty to the errors of their ancestors and they want to right the situation and safeguard the future for themselves and their children.

SUFFRAGE QUALIFICATIONS IN SOUTH AFRICAN PROVINCES

What is the position? In the Cape of Good Hope and the Cape Province we have a franchise, a property and income and literary franchise, and in that Province the Indians are on exactly the same footing and have the same fran-

chise as the whites; no difference is made. But in the other three Provinces of the Union we have a manhood suffrage. In the two Provinces of the interior, the Transvaal and the Free State, that franchise was laid down by the British Government, and not by ourselves. When we received a Constitution after the Boer War, many years ago, this Constitution contained manhood suffrage, and that has remained the state of affairs up to to-day, and will probably remain the state of affairs for a long time. The tendencies in South Africa, just as elsewhere, are all democratic. You cannot go back on that manhood suffrage. Once it has come, you will probably pass on from manhood suffrage to universal suffrage. That was the act of the British Government, and not of the people of South Africa.

EXTENSION OF FRANCHISE TO INDIANS IS IMPOSSIBLE

How are you going to work that in with an Indian franchise? If an Indian franchise were given, it has to be identical; no differentiation would be allowed by Indian public opinion—and quite rightly. Well, the result would be that in Natal, certainly, you would at once have an Indian majority among the voters. But our difficulty is still greater. You have a majority of blacks in the Union, and, if there is to be an equal manhood suffrage over the Union, the whites would be swamped by the blacks; you cannot make a distinction between Indians and Africans; you would be impelled by the inevitable force of logic to go the whole hog, and the result would be that not only would the whites be swamped in Natal by the Indians, but the whites would be swamped all over South Africa by the blacks, and the whole position for which we have striven for 200 years or more now would be given up. So far as South Africa is concerned, therefore, it is a question of impossibility. Sir Tej and his colleagues say, quite rightly, that for India it is a question of dignity. For South Africa, for white South Africa, it is not a question of dignity, but a question of existence, and no Government could for a moment either tamper with this position or do anything to meet the Indian point of view.

1921 RESOLUTION A MISTAKE

That is why I think the resolution passed in 1921 was a mistake. I thought it then, I still think it, a great mistake. We got on the wrong road there. For the first time we passed a resolution through this Conference by a majority. It has never been done before and I do hope it will never occur again. Our procedure in this Conference has been by way of unanimity. If we cannot convince each other we agree to differ and to let the matter stand over. But, for once, we departed from that most salutary principle, which I consider fundamental to the whole Empire, and we passed that resolution by a majority. I had to stand out. But that has made things worse in South Africa. South Africa now certainly sees that she has to stand to her guns much more resolutely than she would have done otherwise. I think we made a mistake in 1921, and that is why I suggested the other alternative consideration of this subject.

POSSESSION OF BRITISH CITIZENSHIP DOES NOT IMPLY RIGHT TO FRANCHISE

Sir Tej said that I was subtle, that my memorandum* was a subtle one. I am not subtle, and my memorandum, I thought was a truism. All that I said was this. There is one British citizenship over the whole Empire, and there should be; that is something solid and enduring; but we must not place a wrong interpretation upon that; we must not derive from the one British citizenship

*See page 138.

rights of Franchise, because that would be a profound mistake. The attitude has been that Franchise does not depend upon British citizenship. It is only in India that this position is not understood. Indians go the length of deriving from their British citizenship the further notion of equal Franchise rights too, and they claim that they may go from India to any other part and enjoy the same Franchise rights as the other portions of the Empire. I think that is a wrong conception. It is wrong not only as regards India, but as regards every part of the Empire. I do not think that an Australian for instance, should come to South Africa and claim the Franchise there as a matter of course. He is a British subject, and on that footing we are equal in the eye of the law, but, when it comes to the exercise of political Franchise rights, I think that there is a great difference and distinction and we should recognise that; and where a distinction is carried into actual practice, as it is in South Africa, it should not be looked upon as an indignity, as a reflection on the citizens of any Dominion, including India, who come to us and who do not get these rights. That is really all I wish to say about this matter.

INDIA CANNOT MAKE QUESTION ONE OF FOREIGN POLICY

I noticed in Sir Tej's statement a remark which almost looked like a threat: that if India fails in forcing on us the view which she holds strongly, then she may be compelled to make of it a question of foreign policy. Well, I would say this, you cannot have it both ways. As long as it is a matter of what are the rights of a British subject, it is not a matter of foreign policy; it is a matter entirely domestic to the British Empire. If it becomes a question of foreign policy, then Indians cannot claim on the ground of their British citizenship any more the recognition of any particular rights. Once they appeal to a tribunal, whether it be the League of Nations or whatever it be, outside the British Empire, they can no longer use as an argument the common British citizenship. I want to keep it there. I want it to be recognized that you must not drive it too far, and you must not derive from that citizenship claims which you cannot uphold.

COMMENT ON SPEECH OF MAHARAJAH OF ALWAR

Let me just say in this regard to what fell from the Maharajah. He said that, if we do not invite him, that he will invite himself.

The MAHARAJAH OF ALWAR: I did not quite say that.

GENERAL SMUTS: Let me say this, Maharajah. Nobody would be more welcome in South Africa than you would be, and I would welcome nothing more than that you should come as a great representative of India to look into conditions in South Africa yourself, convince yourself of the situation there, and convince yourself also that, apart from the far-reaching political difficulties we have, our fundamental attitude towards our Indian fellow-citizens is one of justice and fair play. I do not think that our Indian fellow-subjects in South Africa can complain of injustice. It is just the opposite. They have prospered exceedingly in South Africa. People who have come there as coolies, people who have come there as members of the depressed classes in India, have prospered. Their children have been to school; they have been educated, and their children and grandchildren to-day are many of them men of great wealth.

I noticed the other day that the Reverend Mr. Andrews, who is a great friend of the Indian cause in South Africa, publicly advised Indians in South Africa not to go back to India. The Government of South Africa actually pay for their tickets, give them pocket money and other inducements in order voluntarily to return to India, and thousands avail themselves of that policy and

return to India. That gentleman, who is a great protagonist of the Indian cause, has publicly advised Indians not to fall in with that policy. He says: "You will be worse off in India." I quote this to show that there is no unfairness, no injustice to our fellow-citizens in India; but, when they come forward and make claims which, politically, we cannot possibly recognize, our attitude of friendliness will worsen and the position as regards them will become very difficult and complicated.

The MAHARAJAH OF ALWAR: I should just like to get my mind a little more clear on one point, and that is with regard to settlers in Natal who have built their houses, invested their money and spent their money there. What would you propose about them?

GENERAL SMUTS: They have all the rights, barring the rights of voting for Parliament and Provincial Councils, that any white citizens in South Africa have. Our law draws no distinction whatever. It is only political rights that are in question. There, as I have explained to you, we are up against a stone wall and we cannot get over it.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, IRISH FREE STATE

SYMPATHY OF IRISH FREE STATE WITH INDIAN CLAIMS

Mr. FITZGERALD: Prime Minister, in our country I do not need to say we have no racial distinctions at all. Indians in Ireland have the same position as Englishmen or South Africans. It seems to me that this matter falls more or less into two classes. There are the Indians in the Dominions and the Indians in the Colonies and mandated territories, etc. Now we recognize the Dominions as independent Sovereign countries, having a perfect right to look after their own affairs, and we really have no right to interfere there, and in the mandated territories and Protectorates they are controlled by the British Government and we have no responsibility. So all that I can do really is to give an opinion. We have no responsibility in the matter; but, if we had responsibility, we should have to protest very strongly against any racial distinctions being made. We who are not Anglo-Saxons have suffered a good deal in the past from being treated as an inferior race. Now the Indian representatives here are not on an equality with the rest of us, because they are not really here in a representative capacity; they are not really sent by an independent Indian Government, and they cannot really be regarded as equal with the rest of us. If I were an Indian, putting myself in their position, I would recognize that this hypersensitiveness about their treatment outside of India arises really from the fact that they have not, so far, reached the degree of self-government that the rest of us have reached. With regard to Indians in the Protectorates and so on, the Government which is primarily responsible for those places being the Government which is also responsible for India, it seems to us unjust that there should be any distinction drawn between Indians and other British subjects in those places.

PROGRESS TOWARDS SELF-GOVERNMENT ONLY SOLUTION

At the same time it seems to me that the only solution of this trouble, which comes from racial sensitiveness, is for Indians to be in a position to make real reciprocal arrangements and to make bargain for bargain. The only way that this Indian trouble is really going to be solved is for that progress towards self-government—whatever form of self-government they consider suitable for themselves—to be hastened with all speed so as to avoid what Sir Tej

and the Maharajah indicated revolutionary methods taking the place of evolutionary methods. We in our country must necessarily sympathize wholeheartedly with the Indians both in their protests against their inferior race treatment and in their feelings as to the freedom of their country. We also recognize quite plainly here that we have no right to dictate to the other Dominions as to what they do in their own areas. That is all I have to say, Prime Minister.

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF NEWFOUNDLAND

TRIBUTE TO PRESENTATION OF CASE FOR INDIA

Mr. WARREN: I must add my congratulations to the Indian Delegation upon the eloquence and force of the speeches they have made.

NO DISABILITIES IN NEWFOUNDLAND

As far as Newfoundland is concerned, we have no distinction whatever. As long as an Indian is a British subject he can vote in Newfoundland in the same way as an Australian, Canadian, or New Zealander, or anybody else. We have no restriction on immigration and I may say that, if an Indian is not a British subject, the mere fact that he is an Indian is no bar to his becoming naturalized and obtaining the vote in that way in Newfoundland. I do not want to express any opinion upon the internal affairs of any other sister Dominion.

STATEMENT BY SIR TEJ BAHADUR SAPRU

APPRECIATION OF RECEPTION OF PROPOSALS

Sir TEJ BAHADUR SAPRU: Prime Minister, I must tell you, and through you your colleagues in His Majesty's Government, and the Dominion Prime Ministers that I could not have hoped to have had a better hearing here. Therefore my thanks are due to one and all of you, even though it may not be that I see eye to eye with you in some of your remarks.

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES

I will first of all refer to the speech delivered this morning by His Grace the Duke of Devonshire. I listened with deep interest to his speech, and let me express to him my thanks for the manner in which he has expressed sympathy with our general aspirations in this matter. His Grace was good enough to say that he did not want to mislead India in regard to Kenya, and, therefore, he spoke frankly. I hope His Grace will pardon me if I also desire to be equally frank in giving expression to our position. I did not expect at any moment during the last few days that I have been working over this question that I would go back with the Kenya decision reversed. That was not what I was aiming at; but I want to make it abundantly plain that I do not wish the substance of my proposition to be affected. The language of the resolution is a matter for settlement; but it is of the very essence of that resolution that Kenya must come in. Secondly, I want to explain that, while His Grace has said that His Majesty's Government are not prepared to accept

the resolution in regard to Kenya, my country will refuse to accept that decision as final. Thirdly, I will make it plain that the Committee I have proposed should, in conferring with the Colonial Office, have the widest scope —that is to say, it must discuss not only questions affecting other Colonies, but also those relating to Kenya: otherwise I do not see that you can possibly satisfy my countrymen.

This is all I wanted to say with regard to the Committee and its dealings with the Colonial Office here. Well, I will now pass on from the Duke of Devonshire and the Colonial Office to the Dominion Ministers.

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

I have listened with very great interest to the speech of Mr. Mackenzie King, and must thank him heartily for supporting me and accepting the substance of my proposal.

INTERPRETATION OF RESOLUTION OF 1921 CONFERENCE

There are just one or two words with regard to his speech that I would like to say. He referred to his view, or rather the construction put in his Parliament, on the Resolution of 1921, and he read out a passage from Mr. Meighen's speech. Now let me tell him that we are here sitting, not as lawyers, nor are we sitting in a Court of Law; our functions are quite different. I suppose that we would claim that the functions of a statesman are very much higher than those of a lawyer, although I myself happen to be associated with that noble profession. Now that Resolution of 1921 I believe was not drafted by a conveyancing lawyer, it was probably drafted by someone of the statesmen around this table or by someone similar to a statesman, and I would like you and your Parliament to approach it from the point of view of the statesman. I know that as a Prime Minister and as a party politician it may be safe to rely on certain phrases, but let me tell him that it would be a great mistake to dispose of those words "it is desirable" as not morally binding upon him —I do not care whether they are legally binding upon him or not.

HOPES FOR GOOD RESULT FROM APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE

I am inspired by the hope, and particularly by the manner in which Mr. King has spoken, that the result of the conference of the Committee which we propose to send to Canada with the Committee going to be appointed there to consider the questions of franchise cannot but lead to satisfactory results. I will not anticipate the verdict of the conference of the two Committees, which Mr. King has to a certain extent attempted to do. I will leave it entirely to the hands of the Committee to come to their own conclusions, and then will be the time for us to discuss how far we are in agreement or how far we are separated. But I recognize his spirit of support and of sympathy with me, and I appreciate that. I do thank you, Mr. Mackenzie King, for the spirit in which you have spoken this morning.

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF PRIME MINISTER OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

From Mr. Mackenzie King I shall pass on to Mr. Bruce, and let me express my unreserved admiration for the manner in which he has spoken this morning, and the tribute he has paid to my countrymen and our civilization. I note that he considers it unnecessary for my Government to send any Committee to his country because he thinks the problem is such that it may be

settled without any discussion. Well, that is encouraging to me, but I do venture to express a hope that, if we do decide to send a Committee just to place our case before him and his Government, he will not refuse to accept that Committee. We do not want to send a Committee to create any agitation in his country—or for the matter of that any agitation in any country—and I can absolutely feel sure that that is not what is at the back of my mind; but, if it is necessary for us to explain our position to you and to help you in the problem, for Heaven's sake do not refuse to accept a Committee like that. We want simply to help you, and, if without receiving a Committee from my Government and my country you can solve the problem, so much the better for you, so much the better for us, and so much the more creditable to you and to your Government.

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF PRIME MINISTER OF NEW ZEALAND

Well, my thanks are also due to Mr. Massey. I hope Mr. Massey will recognize that in my speech of Wednesday I thanked him. I very much appreciate his reference to the services of India during the war, and I do sincerely hope that such grievances as there may be in his country will receive sympathetic treatment at his hands. I do hope that he will accept the substance of my Resolution. We wish to help him in every possible way; we do not want to harass him in his own country or in his Government.

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Now from Mr. Massey I propose to pass to General Smuts. I am sorry to miss him here, but I will say he has never replied to the points I raised. He referred to my description of him as subtle: well, if he objects to that I will withdraw it, but I will say that his present speech is remarkably illusory and evasive.

I raised questions with regard to specific grievances, relating to residence, acquisition of land, and trading licences in his country, and I find no expression of opinion upon those questions. He then said my Resolution had nothing to do with him.

It has primarily to do with him. I made it abundantly plain in the course of my speech that I did not make an appeal to him on the basis of the resolution of 1921, but that my appeal was made to him independently of that resolution and that I wanted him to join hands with me in investigating the facts and in trying to devise some methods of solving this problem, which he probably thinks is insoluble, but which does not appear to me to be insoluble. Again, he referred to Mr. Sastri, and to the prejudice he has caused. I have already said what I felt about Mr. Sastri, and I do not want to say more. If Mr. Sastri's fault was that he pleaded for his countrymen in the Dominions, then that is a fault which can reasonably be found with the 320 millions of his countrymen.

MEANING OF BRITISH CITIZENSHIP

Now I will come to one particular portion of the speech which struck me as based on an entire misconception, legal and constitutional. That is the question of citizenship. He said that India was the only country which probably claimed all political rights merely from the fact that Indians were British citizens. Let we warn him that India is not the only country which holds that view. There are other countries which hold those views. Well, he absolutely confuses the territorial law with personal law; in other words, his position really is this, that, if in my own country I did not enjoy full rights of citizenship, when I go to his country I must be under a disability. I will put to

General Smuts, what would have happened if an Irishman, before the new constitution came into force, had gone from Ireland and had settled down in Natal or any other part there and was told: "Because you are not a free nation within your own borders, you dare not claim those rights, although you are qualified according to our Franchise Law to claim them"? There is an essential confusion in the position which General Smuts takes. Really the fact of the matter is, that you cannot, according to modern law of citizenship and according to the lastest development of thought on this subject, have two kinds of citizenship in the same Empire, a higher and a lower.

When I go to your country, and I do satisfy the requirements of the law of franchise, you have no right to tell me that because I am an Indian subject of His Majesty I shall not be entitled to exercise my Parliamentary rights. Therein lies the whole position General Smuts has taken, and, with regard to the disability of Indians in the purchase of townlands and in respect of trade licences and other things, General Smuts, as I have said before, had not a word to say in his speech this morning.

DEPRECATES RESCINDING OF 1921 RESOLUTION

Therefore, the position remains this, that while I receive support, substantial and general, from His Majesty's Government and from all the Dominion Prime Ministers, I have received no support from General Smuts.

On the contrary, he has expressed a desire that the resolution of 1921 should be repealed. I hope for the reputation of this Conference, for the great reputation of the Dominion Prime Ministers and for the reputation of His Majesty's Government, that nothing of the kind will be done, and, though you may tell my countrymen that the problem is undoubtedly a difficult one. I request you also to say that you are trying to discover means of solving it. If you will do that you will change our attitude in regard to great Imperial questions.

POSITION OF INDIANS ALREADY IN SOUTH AFRICA

There is only one more remark I will make in regard to General Smuts' speech. He referred to the desire for repatriation and to the advice of Mr. Andrews. Let me tell you that, if anyone understands Mr. Andrews or knows him intimately, I do. There are hundreds and thousands of my countrymen in South Africa who cannot even speak their mother tongue. They have settled there, their fathers have settled there, and it is very easy to understand how difficult they will find it to leave a land in which they and their fathers and grandfathers have lived. It is for those reasons that Mr. Andrews advised, and it is for those reasons that I should advise them, not to leave that country, but to fight their battles until their position is recognized some day or other as that of equal citizens.

MEANING OF ALLUSION TO "FOREIGN POLICY"

General Smuts said that as a British subject I could not claim that this problem would pass from the stage of a domestic problem to that of a foreign problem. He misunderstood me. It is not difficult to foresee a stage being reached when even the Government of India, whom he has attacked over its attitude in regard to Kenya, but which I must admire for the very same attitude which it did take, may find it necessary to appeal to His Majesty's Government, and to say, that one part of the Empire is standing against the other, and it is for you, His Majesty's Government, now to treat this problem inside your own Commonwealth as you would deal with a problem of foreign policy. That

is what I meant, and I do anticipate a stage like that being reached at no distant date in so far as the relation of India with South Africa is concerned.

COMMENT ON STATEMENTS OF MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, IRISH FREE STATE, AND OF PRIME MINISTER OF NEWFOUNDLAND

Lastly, I will pass on to what my friend, Mr. Desmond Fitzgerald, said. No one could be more happy or contented than myself if he could help me to get self-government for India to-day, but that is a matter between us and His Majesty's Government. I see no reason, however, why until we get complete self-government in India we should be treated on a lower footing in King George's Empire outside India. We have a strong sentiment on that point, and there can be no weakening in that sentiment so far as I am concerned and so far as my fellow-countrymen are concerned. There is no one who believes more strongly than I do, or is working harder than I am, to win self-government for India, and, God willing, I do hope to win it notwithstanding any doubts that may be entertained by members of His Majesty's Government. But I will not allow those considerations to affect my position in regard to the status of Indians overseas. Suppose we get Dominion self-government to-morrow in India, the problem will still have to be faced. Therefore let us not mix up the two. I should be very glad indeed if the Conference would endorse a resolution in favour of self-government, but I want them to endorse a resolution, also in regard to Indians and their position overseas. I must also thank Mr. Warren for the support he has given me.

WISHES TO PRESS PROPOSAL FOR RESOLUTION

There is only one word that remains for me to say. When I moved that resolution I perhaps did not make it quite clear that I was moving it. I merely said: "My resolution is as follows." I wish the Conference to understand that I definitely moved that resolution. I have already said I am open to argument in regard to the phraseology of it so long as the substance remains and so long as Kenya finds a place in it. That is a matter which is between me and the Colonial Office and could be sent up to you later on, but I do wish to move that resolution, and I beg your support; at any rate I am entitled to ask for the support of the general idea embodied in that resolution. I do wish it to be understood that, so far as I am concerned, I stand by the resolution of 1921 and by the principle of equality. I do not wish to put any larger interpretation on the resolution than is justified or is just, but do not let me give you the impression that there is any weakening on my part so far as the resolution of 1921 is concerned or so far as the supplementary resolution which I had the honour to put before you on Wednesday last is concerned. I thank you, Prime Minister, and all the other Prime Ministers.

OCTOBER 31, 1923

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA, AS HEAD OF THE INDIAN DELEGATION

THANKS FOR RECEPTION OF PROPOSAL OF INDIAN DELEGATION

LORD PEEL: I desire to thank most sincerely the Members of the Conference for the very cordial and sympathetic way in which they have received our proposals about the position of Indians in the Empire. I thank them also for the high place that they have assigned to this question among Empire problems. I thank them for the complete grasp that they have displayed of this difficult

business, not as an isolated or local or Indian question, but in its Imperial aspect. I am grateful to them for the complete frankness and fulness with which they have explained the views of those they represent.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF DISCUSSION

In opening this discussion, I explained that the intensity of the feeling aroused in India was due to the opinion widely held there, that the disabilities of Indians were based on distinction of colour, and were badges of racial inferiority. I did not associate myself with that view. I believe it to be mistaken. The course of this discussion has shown that I was amply justified. Any impartial person reviewing the statements made will find it impossible to prove that any general ban is maintained against Indians in the Empire or that throughout the Empire they are placed in an inferior status; or again, that such disabilities as they may suffer from are based on colour or racial grounds.

The Duke of Devonshire has shown that in the West Indian Colonies—British Guiana, Jamaica, Trinidad—Indians enjoy the same rights as other British subjects. The same, I believe, is true in Ceylon and Mauritius.

Mr. Mackenzie King has told us that in eight out of nine provinces in Canada Indians enjoy full rights of citizenship. If in one province there are exceptions to the general rule, these exceptions are based, not on the colour distinction, but on rather complicated social and political considerations.

Mr. Bruce has told us that representatives of every shade of political thought in Australia have shown sympathy with the claim that lawfully domiciled Indians should enjoy full citizen rights. He believes that Australian public opinion is ready to welcome, as far as the position of domiciled Indians is concerned, any measure which is conceived in the interests of the Empire as a whole.

General Smuts said, "It is not a question of colour; it is a different principle. . . . It is the case of a small civilization, a small community, finding itself in danger of being overwhelmed by a much older and more powerful civilization; it is the economic competition from people who have entirely different standards and viewpoints from ourselves."

The same sentiments have been expressed by the representatives of the other Dominions, and notably by Mr. Massey. These opinions, so remarkably similar in tone, of this great body of Empire statesmen, must surely bring conviction and comfort to any Indian whose feelings may have been injured or whose sense of dignity may have been impaired by a contrary view. Let their suspicions and their doubts be allayed by these declarations of the Empire leaders, sent out to the world from this Conference.

NOT DESIRABLE TO PRESS RESOLUTION

Let me now consider whether any action should be taken on the definite proposals placed before the Conference by my colleague, Sir Tej Sapru. He was not concerned, nor was the Delegation concerned, so much with his concrete proposals as with the attitude that would be taken up by the Prime Ministers in their different Dominions on this subject. I consider that the position of the Indians within the Empire has been most notably advanced in this Conference. Mr. Bruce has stated that he thinks that further enquiry is unnecessary, but that, on his return to Australia, he will consult with his colleagues and see what action can be taken. Mr. Mackenzie King has reaffirmed his statement about the revision of the Federal Law, and he is quite willing, if it is thought desirable to send a Delegation to Canada, to appoint a group to meet and confer with such Delegation. I rather gather, however, that the passing of this particular

resolution might not necessarily assist in obtaining the result which we desire. General Smuts, I am afraid, will not be able to support the resolution. General Smuts, it is true, did not support the resolution of 1921. I should like to say that I do not rest my case entirely on the resolution. If there had been no resolution of 1921, this problem would still be urgent and pressing. The resolution of 1921 stands, but I rest my case not merely upon a formula but upon the broad equities of the case and an appeal for justice and Imperial unity. I am quite aware of the difficulties of South Africa, but I hope General Smuts, when he returns, while alive to his own difficulties, will retain a vivid consciousness of our own.

It has been said that the Empire Conference should be unanimous in its resolutions. I think that, if this resolution is pressed, some members might be disposed not to vote for it; not because they do not sympathize with the end to be attained, but because they think this particular means is either unnecessary or perhaps not desirable. Such a vote, therefore, might create a totally false impression in India of the real situation. I ask my friend, Sir Tej Sapru, whether he might not consider it advisable not to press his resolution. But I am very anxious that it should be made quite plain in India what are the results that have been attained. I think it would be most valuable if a short note could be added to the Report of the Conference showing clearly what are the practical results of this discussion and what India has gained.

STATEMENT BY HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJAH OF ALWAR

The Maharajah of Alwar: In this world of ours a great deal, if not everything, depends on how far, and how, we are able to control our human nature and in what channels we can guide it in order to achieve successful results. It is easy enough to see the dark patches, to brood over difficulties, to exaggerate and enlarge upon them, and finally to be overcome with remorse, repentance or despair.

But history teaches us the great lesson that the world advances and does not recede, when, without deluding ourselves, we are able to buckle our determination and throw our vision beyond the clouds on to the silver lining. Humanity, after all, behind which shines the radiance of the Godhead, is not so black as our imaginations and our unfulfilled desires and hopes are likely sometimes to paint it. Stone upon stone can steadily be built into an edifice with a single-hearted purpose, with the help of cement of our goodwill and toleration.

OBJECTS OF CONFERENCE

I conceive that our Conference of the members of the British Empire has assembled in order to shed light over the dark patches, to exercise our determination in subscribing our quota to solve difficult problems, and, instead of hypnotizing ourselves with pessimism, to enable us to look ahead to the dawn which must invariably follow the night.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

India did not figure in the Agenda of our Conference when we assembled around this table, but, as an Indian, I thank the Prime Minister and the British Government for having agreed to our suggestion to set aside a day for the discussion of the important problem of Indians overseas. We owe acknowledgments for letting the discussion extend to a much longer time than originally conceived, in order to give everyone an opportunity to unburden their mind and to put forward their points of view.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 37a

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS DISCUSSION, AND THANKS TO PRIME MINISTERS AND OTHER SPEAKERS

In my own personal capacity I said at the commencement of the Conference that rightly or wrongly—and I believe rightly—I came with the determination of giving co-operation and goodwill, and I am happy to be able to acknowledge to-day that during our discussions we have found the full measure of it.

I thank the Prime Minister of Canada for having given a very welcome lead, in viewing our problem, relating to his Dominion, from a broad point of view.

On behalf of my Order I thank Mr. Bruce for his sympathy, and the Prime Ministers of New Zealand and of Newfoundland for the very warm and cordial support of India as related to their Dominions.

From Ireland came a very warm-hearted response towards their fellow-citizens of the Empire in my country.

I hope I may even thank General Smuts for such kind references as he has made for my countrymen, and I thank him for extending to me personally an invitation to come to South Africa to see for myself the problems and difficulties that exist. I sincerely hope that I may be able to accept his very kind invitation and I almost wish I was going back with him to his country. But at the present moment this is not feasible; but that invitation will certainly not pass into oblivion, but will remain in a tender corner of my heart, and I hope for the sake of my country I may be able to respond to it at no great distant date. I make it clear, however, that I should like to come in my personal capacity and not as a representative of my country or of my Order, for that would be the best way to enhance my own personal knowledge of the difficulties that exist and to understand the problems that exist in that country which are, perhaps, the main sources of the whole question having come up so prominently.

General Smuts will appreciate, however, that, although I may deprive myself of coming as a representative, I shall still come as an Indian and as one in whose heart these questions undoubtedly rankle, but who, for his personal satisfaction—and if he can be of any use and is desired to be of any use to his country—will be able to do so, while at the same time keeping in mind the broader view of trying fully to appreciate the difficulties that exist on the different sides.

POSITION OF INDIANS IN CANADA

Now what is the position of Indians overseas as we see it to-day on the bright side, if you look? Mr. Mackenzie King has told us that in Canada there are eight provinces in which no legal disability exists as regards Indians, and where, I understand, they have equal rights of franchise.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There are nine provinces. They have no legal disabilities; there is a political disability in one; that is all.

IN AUSTRALIA

The MAHARAJAH OF ALWAR: In Australia, although the domiciled Indians amount only to about 2,000, we have the promise of the Australian Premier that they will be treated sympathetically and that this question has been the subject of considerable public discussion and the representatives of every shade of political thought have shown sympathy with the claim that lawfully domiciled Indians should enjoy full citizen rights and finally that, so far as the position of Indians domiciled in Australia is concerned, any measure which is conceived in the interests of the Empire as a whole would be welcomed.

IN NEW ZEALAND

In New Zealand the number of Indians is small, but the spirit which recognizes no difference of race, colour or creed is indeed one that should inspire not only our admiration, but also our gratitude, and the Prime Minister of New Zealand has told us that they give the Indian residents in New Zealand practically the same privileges which are enjoyed by people of the Anglo-Saxon race, and that there is practically no difference between them.

It is even a happy augury to hear words come out of the mouth of this responsible Statesman that the Aboriginal Tribes in New Zealand are in exactly the same position as the European residents, and that they have the same privileges in parliamentary and local affairs.

IN NEWFOUNDLAND

In Newfoundland the numbers of Indians are smaller still, but we are glad to see the same spirit prevailing there as in New Zealand.

IN IRISH FREE STATE

In Ireland the problem does not arise, but we nevertheless appreciate and welcome the sentiments on behalf of its Representatives.

IN SOUTH AFRICA

In South Africa, General Smuts has told us that, in the Cape of Good Hope and the Cape Province, Indians are on exactly the same footing as the Whites and have a franchise. General Smuts has hinted to us that in the Transvaal and the Free State the franchise was not laid down by South Africa, but by the British Government.

IN COLONIES, PROTECTORATES, &C.

And now after the Dominions I come to the Colonies. His Grace the Colonial Secretary has told us that, so far as British Colonies and Protectorates are concerned, in the West Indian Colonies British Indians are under no political or legal disability. This includes British Guiana, Trinidad and Jamaica where there is a considerable Indian population. In Ceylon, qualified British Indians will be eligible for the franchise in the same way as other British subjects. In Mauritius there is distinction between Indian and other British subjects as regards eligibility for the franchise.

In East Africa there is no restriction on the number or race of the unofficial members who may be nominated on the Executive Councils of Kenya or Uganda.

EXISTING DIFFICULTIES

Now, Gentlemen, I have to say this, that I know some people who read what I have said so far may consider that I have spoken in empty platitudes; and that in doing so I am seeking favours or honour. How far that vision is from my mind it is not necessary to state, but, if looking on the bright side of things is wrong in appreciating the facts that are already before us, then I gladly stand open to the charge and have no bones of contention to pick, but the primary reason why I have taken your time in emphasizing these facts is in order to condense what I have already seen, that the whole of the British Empire is not such a dark patch for our countrymen as some would like to believe, and that there is much ground to improve the situation by showing our goodwill and co-operation. This does not mean that I do not

appreciate the difficulties where they lie—and they do lie. It is not difficult for human nature to bite or to sting, but those are qualities which do not appeal to me in such an atmosphere as this.

The difficulties that exist with regard to Indians overseas exist I know—and all know—in British Columbia in Canada, in Natal in South Africa, and have reached their climax in Kenya. In British Columbia, Mr. Mackenzie King has told us, very frankly and candidly, that it is a question of Provincial franchise where the Federal Franchise Act supports it which places Indians in a position of disability. Mr. Mackenzie King has said that his action when viewed in India would be very much a matter of the spirit of interpretation—where he is entirely right—for it is the spirit in which we take such things that the problems come before us.

In British Columbia we are told that the problem is not a racial one, but an economic one, and that Mr. Mackenzie King welcomes the proposition made by Sir Tej for a Committee to go to Canada to discuss this question with his Government.

The responsible statesmen of Canada have been good enough to say that they welcomed Mr. Sastri and gave him full opportunity to speak and confer with any persons he might wish to do so in order to meet the difficulty, and finally that, when the Federal Law comes up for revision, Canada will take care that Parliament is informed of India's wishes. We sincerely hope that they will pay every favourable consideration to this important point regarding our people

In Natal, General Smuts has equally candidly explained that if he gave Indians the right to franchise on an equality it could not then be withheld from the native population of South Africa, and would, under the circumstances, flood this portion of the country and demolish the work of the White settlers of 200 years, and this is, indeed, a potent argument and I appreciate the difficulties, but the question as regards Natal, as also of other places where such disabilities exist, does not hinge on the future migrations flooding this country, for, with right understanding, I believe the Government of India's co-operation can be achieved to solve this difficulty, but the question is with regard to Indian settlers who have lived in Natal and who have invested their property and have settled there for several generations. Is it likely that, without the franchise, laws will be passed by those who possess the franchise to oust the Indians from their rightful heritage, since they went to that country under the British flag as peaceful settlers? General Smuts gave the assurance in answer to my question that Indians would have the full rights of citizenship, and the only question concerned with the difficulty was with regard to franchise. I hope that the Prime Minister of South Africa will give this question favourable consideration, not from a local, but from an Imperial point of view, in order to see that no disabilities exist which would hamper the peaceful existence of my countrymen there. It would, indeed, be a useful advance in conciliatory methods if General Smuts could see his way to asking his Parliament to welcome our Committee to go there from India in order to discuss frankly, candidly and, if necessary, quietly, the whole problem as it affects India.

KENYA

And now I come to Kenya. I believe, from what I am informed and from what I have seen myself, that no question of Indians overseas agitates their minds and gives them more feeling of racial discrimination and loss of self-respect than Indians in Kenya. This I believe to be mainly due to the fact that, while it has been asserted by previous Imperial Conferences that the Dominions have a right to settle their own populations, Kenya is not a self-

governing Dominion, but is a Colony administered by the British Government. It is to the British Government, therefore, that Indians look to see that their position, which has already become very awkward in Kenya by the minority of white settlers being given a majority in votes, is not further jeopardized and that they are not placed under disabilities by laws being passed by the majority segregating them or eventually ousting them from positions in which they have invested money in the country which, I understand, they have helped to improve for many years back.

I understand—and if I am wrong in my assumption I hope I will be corrected—that His Grace, holding the charge of the Colonial Office at present, has been good enough to agree that the Committee of India would be welcomed to discuss with him the whole problem, and that the entire question will be fully and sympathetically considered by the Imperial Government from the points of view put forward by the Indian Committee. May I thank His Grace and, through him, the British Government, for this assurance, and earnestly hope that the final results will be an advance on the present situation and give cause for my countrymen to be grateful for assistance?

PERSONAL POSITION

On this important problem of Indians overseas I have little more to say, but I wish to add this, that my position as a Delegate from India is likely to be misunderstood in some quarters and even in India, and therefore I would like to make it clear.

I have not come here as an elected or selected representative of British India. I have not even been elected or selected by my Brother Princes, or have their mandate.

I think you know that I am not an employee of the British Government, but in accordance with past precedent I have come here as the nominated representative of the Indian Princes and have been invited to work here by the Government of India and the Secretary of State. But, although I carry no mandate for what I say for my Order, I nevertheless happen to be one of them. I am an Indian and I belong to a family who have been loyal and faithful allies of the Crown and its Government. I have, therefore, primarily expressed my own views, but I hope also what I feel to be the views of my Order and my countrymen, or at least some of them.

I have much appreciated the compliment of having been asked to work on this Conference, but, for the sake of my country, I hope that my successor at the next one will be even more fortunate in being elected by my Order to come to this distinguished gathering in consultation, with the approval of the Viceroy and the Secretary of State.

I should welcome indeed if our member for two-thirds of India should be privileged to enjoy the same position, but on this topic I will not attempt to speak as it is outside my purview and because I would be charged with treading on ground on which angels fear to go.

CONCLUSION

And now, in conclusion, I will say this. The whole question of Indians overseas is, we are told, in many places, an economic problem; that it is not a racial one, to impress upon anyone the inferiority of any particular race. I, at any rate, welcome that sentiment and I feel, now that this goodwill and co-operation is prevailing on all sides, that the whole of this difficult problem will be set at rest—and the earlier the better—within the domains of possibilities, so that India can turn her mind towards her own domestic problems and work out her salvation to be a loyal and integral part of the British Empire.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 37a

In conclusion, may I thank the Dominion Prime Ministers for the words that have fallen from their lips, where one said that he certainly desired to see India go ahead; and that the 1921 Resolution passed by the previous Conference is regarded as a pledge which all concerned seem anxious to fulfil and to uphold?

Prime Minister and Gentlemen, I thank you one and all for having created in this room that favourable atmosphere towards my country, which I hope will soon bear practical and tangible results, not only for the sake of the British Empire, but for the sake of one-fifth of the human race.

Mr. Harvey, in giving his views recently, when Lord Curzon presided, said: "We have preferred settlement to argument." That exactly sums up my conclusion, and I hope that I may be permitted to express my final sentiments. Although it is in poetry, I think the words exactly express my views:—

"What then shall be the guerdon
(A great and priceless burden)
Of taut'ning up our Grand Old Empire's Chain?
It shall be for us the Glory
To prove in full the story
Our Brotherhood does not exist in vain.

Don't criticize and grumble;
Don't sneer at every stumble;
Let each one try and see the other's aim:
And if at first we fail
To hear the friendly hail
Let us bear in mind the birthright of our slain.

Like them we'll pull together—
Rose and Wattle, Maple, Heather—
Our own bright Star is rising with the morn;
Aye, let's sail the ship together
Thro' storm and stress of weather,
Onward, ever onward, to the Dawn!"

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES, ON BEHALF OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR HOME AFFAIRS

The Duke of Devonshire: I regret to say the Home Secretary is unable to be here this afternoon, but, as a statement* has been circulated to the whole of the Conference which will eventually be published, I would like to make the following observations on his behalf:—

MEANING OF IMPERIAL NATIONALITY

"This interesting and frank discussion has brought out in high relief a distinctive characteristic of the British Empire or Commonwealth—an essential unity attaining realization in varying and independent methods and practices under a great variety of conditions.

"At the core lies the vital principle of common British nationality on which the representatives of India have justly and eloquently laid great stress, and which finds expression in General Smuts' words: 'The common Kinship is the binding link between the parts of the Empire.'

"It is not inconsistent with this principle to recognize as it always has been recognized, that every part of the Empire is free to settle its own domestic concerns, including questions as to the rights to be enjoyed by any person or classes

*See page 138.

of persons within its territory. In considering problems arising out of this right or freedom it is important not to confuse the issue by any ambiguous use of such words as 'citizen' or 'citizenship.' If those words are used, as they rightly may be, as having a local significance and connoting a status or right which it is within the power of any self-governing Dominion to confere on persons within its territory, they should not at the same time be used as though they were almost synonymous with the Imperial conception of nationality.

"Imperial nationality is one and indivisible; local citizenship and the rights and privileges attached thereto may be diverse. If we keep these two conceptions clearly in our minds it ought to be possible, notwithstanding difficulties of detail and practice, to maintain a principle of action consistent alike with Imperial unity and local autonomy."

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. STANLEY BALDWIN: After what has been said on behalf of the Dominions and by the Duke of Devonshire on behalf of the British Government, I have little to add.

RESULT OF INDIAN PROPOSAL AS REGARDS COLONIES AND PROTECTORATES

I should like first of all to read to the Conference a statement which has been drawn up, as the result of informal discussions, since our last meeting. It sets out, for inclusion in the records of the Conference, the result of Sir Tej Sapru's proposal, so far as it relates to the Colonies and Protectorates. The statement is as follows:—

"The Secretary of State for the Colonies, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, cordially accepted the proposal of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru that there should be full consultation and discussion between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and a Committee appointed by the Government of India upon all questions affecting British Indians domiciled in British Colonies, Protectorates and Mandated Territories. At the same time the Duke was careful to explain that, before decisions were taken as a result of discussion with the Committee, consultations with the local Colonial Governments concerned, and in some cases local enquiry, would be necessary.

"Further, while welcoming the proposal, the Duke of Devonshire reminded the Conference that His Majesty's Government had recently come to certain decisions as to Kenya, which represented in their considered view the very best that could be done in all the circumstances. While he saw no prospect of these decisions being modified he would give careful attention to such representations as the Committee appointed by the Government of India might desire to make to him.

"Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, while taking note of the above statement of the Duke, desired to make plain that the recent Kenya decisions could not be accepted as final by the people of India."

PUBLICATION OF SPEECHES

I am glad to think that, on this occasion, we have been able to arrange for the speeches made at this Table to be published. This constitutes a departure from the procedure at the 1921 Conference, when only the resolution which has been quoted here more than once was made public. We shall, of course, include a brief summary of the proceedings when a report on the work of the Conference comes to be prepared.*

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 37a

HELPFUL NATURE OF DISCUSSION

I hope that the Indian delegation will feel, as I feel, that the discussions we have had on this subject have been most helpful and encouraging. There has not merely been goodwill and an earnest attempt to meet India's wishes so far as varying political and economic circumstances in different parts of the Empire permit, but we can record quite definite results. These are due to the growing sense of partnership among all the many peoples and races who owe common allegiance to the Crown. It is this sense of Partnership which I should like to stress. India's value to the Empire and the Empire's value to India are becoming every day more clearly seen. The British Commonwealth of Nations rests upon no narrow basis. It is the greatest association known to the world of many races bound together ever more intimately by common interests and by mutual desire to help each other. Here at these Conferences we can with full freedom learn each other's problems and each other's point of view, and India can, I am sure, feel that the magnitude of her share in our common partnership, and of her contribution to the common weal, is being realized in increasing measure. I am confident that he members of the Conference who have spoken for India will feel, both from the manner in which their representations have been received and from the actual results achived, that mutual goodwill can and does help each and all of us to solve our common problems. I think the Conference as a whole can congratulate itself on what has been effected.

STATEMENT BY SIR TEJ BAHADUR SAPRU

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru: Before the Conference leaves this very important subject, I desire to take up just two minutes of your time in making my own position quite clear.

EFFECT OF DISCUSSION ON INDIAN OPINION

I am completely satisfied with the kindness of my colleagues from the Dominions, and I am sure that Indians throughout the Empire will derive new hope and encouragement from their attitude. This, of course, does not apply to South Africa, regarding which country I had my say on Monday last. As regards the Colonial Office, I am very glad to notice that the Committee to be appointed as I suggested is not to be restricted in its scope to certain specified Colonies. To me, as an Indian, it is, of course, disappointing that the Duke, speaking last Monday, saw no prospect of modifying the Kenya decisions, which, as I have already made clear, can never be accepted in India. But his agreement with the principle of my scheme, and his consent to give careful attention to such representations as the Committee may lay before him, inspires me with the hope that the door is not barred, and that the Colonial Office may be shown the way to an acceptable solution. I shall recommend those with whom I have any influence, both in India and elsewhere, to work through this Committee to obtain an amelioration of such conditions as they and every Indian regard as incompatible with our national dignity and with our position as equal subjects in the Empire of our common Sovereign.

NO NEED TO MOVE FORMAL RESOLUTION

May I here just also refer to the expression of opinion made by Lord Peel to-day with regard to the Resolution that I intended to move on the last

*See pages 17-20 of Cmd. 1987.

occasion? I thoroughly appreciate the advice that has been given to me to-day by Lord Peel. I have noted with great pleasure the spirit of cordiality shown by my colleagues from all over the Empire, except General Smuts. I take their speeches as very encouraging, and I note that what I wanted really has been achieved, namely, that they recognize the character of the Resolution of 1921, and that they have given me a hope that they would do something material to achieve the end which we have in view, namely, the accomplishment of the principle of equality. Most of them have accepted my suggestions about Committees; Mr. Bruce thinks that he can do without a Committee. As I said on a former occasion, so much the more honourable and creditable to him and to his country. It is because I have this support from all the Dominion Prime Ministers excepting one, that it is unnecessary for me to move my Resolution formally.

THANKS TO LORD PEEL

Lastly, will you allow me to say one word about Lord Peel? Throughout the anxious days I have had to spend upon this question within the last two weeks I have received nothing but unreserved support and encouragement from him, and I am sure that, when my countrymen come to know how strongly he has stood by me, they will realize that not only the Government of India and the great Statesman who presides over that country have identified themselves with our national sentiment with regard to this matter, but that the Secretary of State has also done the same. May I thank you, Sir, on behalf of myself and on behalf of those whom I represent? That is all, Sir.

Annexe (A)

POLITICAL STATUS OF BRITISH INDIANS IN THE COLONIES, PROTECTORATES, AND MANDATED TERRITORIES

Memorandum Prepared in the Colonial Office

West Indies.

In the *West Indies* British Indians are under no political or legal disability of any kind. They have the same franchise and the same opportunities of becoming members of elective bodies as any other British subjects.

The West Indian colonies in which there is a considerable British Indian population are British Guiana, Trinidad and Jamaica. It may be of interest to add some particulars regarding the franchise in these colonies.

In *British Guiana* the property qualifications for voters are somewhat complicated, and the following may serve as examples. Persons are qualified to be voters for counties if they have an annual income or salary of $480 or are tenants of a house, or house and land, of an annual rental of $192. A person is qualified as a voter for a city or town if he possesses a similar income or salary, or is a tenant to the value of $120. In either case, the payment of $20 in taxes qualifies. No person is entitled to be registered as a voter unless he can read and write some language.

In *Trinidad* the Legislative Council is at present nominated, but the elective system will be introduced at an early date. A person desirous of being registered as a voter must be able to satisfy the Registration Officer that he or she can understand the English language when spoken, and must possess one of a number of property qualifications. An annual salary of £62 10s., or the payment of £12 10s. for rent, or the occupation of land, or land and house thereon, assessed to taxes at 10s. a year will qualify.

In *Jamaica* the qualification for voters is the receipt of salary or wages of £50, or income of a similar amount combined with the payment of a rental of £10, or the payment of taxes of 10s. on real property or £1 10s. on personal property.

Eastern Colonies.

In *Ceylon*, under a revised Constitution about to be issued, qualified British Indians will be eligible for the franchise and for election to the Legislative Council in the same manner as all other British subjects. In addition, they will have the privilege of electing two Indian representatives on a communal basis. The property qualification for the franchise is reasonably low.

In *Mauritius* there is no distinction between British Indians and other British subjects as regards eligibility for the franchise. Moderate property and educational qualifications are imposed in all cases. An Indian member is also specially nominated to the Council of Government, to represent Indian interests.

In the *Straits Settlements* provision for an Indian representative, nominated by the Governor, is made in the recently revised Constitution of the Legislative Council.

With regard to the *Federated Malay States*, the Government of India has recently suggested that Indians should have representation in the Federal Council. This question is now under discussion with the High Commissioner.

Southern Pacific.

In Fiji the question of the political representation of Indians is still under consideration.

Eastern Africa.

In *Kenya*, where there are four communities to consider, the communal system of representation in the Legislative Council has, after careful consideration, been adopted. The European British subjects vote for eleven elected members on an adult franchise. The Indians will vote for five elected members on a wide franchise, which will be determined in consultation with the Indian community. The Arabs will vote for one elected member on a franchise to be determined in a similar manner. Until the political education of the African is advanced, African interests will be represented by a non-African, nominated, unofficial member, who will be a missionary.

The unofficial members of the Executive Council are not limited either as to race or numbers by the instrument of Government. Hitherto, there have been two European unofficial members and one Indian unofficial member, and it is hoped to continue this arrangement, with the addition of an unofficial member whose advise on matters affecting Africans will be of value.

In each Council there is an absolute official majority.

In *Uganda* the Legislative Council is not elective. There is no restriction on the number or race of the unofficial members who may be nominated to the Council. The members at present approved are two Europeans and one Indian. There is an official majority.

In the Executive Council, there are no unofficial members.

In the *Tanganyika Territory* there is no Legislative or Executive Council; but, speaking generally, Indians have the same rights as the citizens of other countries members of the League of Nations.

COLONIAL OFFICE, October, 1923.

Annexe (B)

THE POSITION OF INDIANS IN THE BRITISH EMPIRE

Memorandum by the Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa

Before the Conference comes to consider this thorny subject, I wish my colleagues to consider the following suggestion of a way out of the difficulties in which we find ourselves. In India the position of Indians in other parts of the Empire seems to be adding to the political agitation and unrest, while in those other parts the atmosphere for the solution of the difficulty is not improving, but on the contrary getting worse. This latter change is in some measure due to the Sastri mission. Mr. Sastri by his mission and his speeches has undoubtedly made matters worse. He has, for instance, never failed, whenever opportunity presented itself, to attack the Indian policy of South Africa, and has thereby greatly exasperated public opinion in that Dominion, already very sensitive on this issue. In other Dominions he has made people alive to the issue—indeed he has largely created it. The claim he has everywhere vigorously pressed for equal franchise rights for Indians over the whole Empire has not only gone further than the local claims of the Indians themselves, but has tended to raise opposition in quarters where it did not exist before. It is because I foresaw this development that I did not invite Mr. Sastri to include South Africa in his mission. It is not alleged that the economic position of Indians in other parts of the Empire is bad. It is admitted that they are successful and thriving under the laws of the Dominions, and are in most respects economically better off than they would be in India. But the claim is put forward for equal political rights throughout the Empire, and its denial is looked upon as a stigma, as an affront to our Indian fellow-subjects. And no questions are more difficult and dangerous than those involving national dignity and honour.

The Indian claim for equal franchise rights in the Empire outside of India arises, in my opinion, from a misconception of the nature of British citizenship. This misconception is not confined to India, but is fairly general, and the Conference would do not only India but the whole Empire an important service by its removal. The misconception arises, not from the fact, but from the assumption, that all subjects of the King are equal, that in an Empire where there is a common King, there should be a common and equal citizenship, and that all differences and distinctions in citizen rights are wrong in principle. Hence it is claimed that, whether a British subject has or has not political rights in his country of origin, he should, on migration to another part of the Empire where British subjects enjoy full political rights, be entitled automatically to the enjoyment of these rights. It is on this basis that equal political rights are claimed for Indians who live in the Dominions or Colonies outside of India.

It is, of course, clear that the assumption on which the claim is based is wrong. There is no equality of British citizenship throughout the Empire. On the contrary, there is every imaginable difference. In some parts British subjects have no political rights whatever; in others they have modified rights of one kind or another; in others, again, they have the fullest political rights. In the same part you may find British subjects with little or no political rights, and others with full rights. There is no common equal British citizenship in the Empire, and it is quite wrong for a British subject to claim equality of rights in any part of the Empire to which he has migrated or where he happens to be living. There is no indignity or affront at all in the denial of such equality. Once this is clearly recognized, the stigma above referred to falls away. Indians in those parts of the Empire where they do not enjoy equal franchise rights cannot justly or fairly claim that their national dignity or status is involved.

I go even further. The newer conception of the British Empire as a smaller League of Nations, as a partnership of free and equal nations under a common hereditary Sovereign, involves an even further departure from the simple conception of a unitary citizenship. British citizenship has been variable in the past; it is bound to be even more so in the future. Each constituent part of the Empire will settle for itself the nature and incidents of its citizenship. The composition and character and rights of its people will be the concern of each free and equal State in the Empire. It will not only regulate immigration from other parts of the Empire as well as from the outside world, but it will also settle the rights of its citizens as a matter of domestic concern. The common Kingship is the binding link between the parts of the Empire; it is not a source from which private citizens will derive their rights. They will derive their rights simply and solely from the authority of the State in which they live. Hence Indians going to Canada will not be entitled to claim equal political rights with the other citizens of Canada, no more than Canadians going to India or Australia could claim equal political rights there. The conception of the Empire as a League of Nations ought to do away with these claims, which are so disturbing and unsettling in the Empire.

From this point of view the Indian resolution passed at the last Imperial Conference was a profound mistake. It was not only impracticable, but it ran counter to the new conception of the Empire as not a unitary State but a partnership of equal States. It has both theoretically and practically landed us in a false position, and the sooner we get out of it the better for the future good relations of the different States of the Empire. The political claims of Indians arising under that resolution should not be allowed to create difficulties for the Governments of the Dominions, which would not have arisen if the constitutional position had been properly appreciated.

The Indian Government should not claim from the other Empire Governments what (say) the friendly Governments of Japan and China would not claim. And the fact is that with neither of these Governments have we any difficulties in the Dominions, while the difficulties with India are notorious and growing.

We must get to the right constitutional conception, which I take to be the absolute and unquestioned power and authority of each part of the Empire to settle such questions for itself. India has threatened retaliation as a method of reprisal against Dominions which do not concede equal rights to her nationals. This is, again, a false position arising out of the misconception which I have explained. There should be no question either of retaliation or reprisal. India should be free to deal with nationals of the Dominions on a basis of reciprocal treatment, and neither on her part nor on the part of the Dominions concerned should there be any resentment or ill-feeling in the matter. Our relations in this regard should be practically those of friendly sovereign States towards each other. Unless this readjustment of viewpoint is brought about it is feared that the question of the position of Indians in the Empire may continue to grow in gravity.

I would therefore suggest that for the resolution of the last Conference on the subject there be substituted a resolution affirming the right of each portion of the Empire to regulate citizenship as well as immigration as domestic questions for its own handling and not affecting the status or dignity of other portions of the Empire, and expressing the opinion that provisions for reciprocal treatment of the nationals of the States of the Empire should not be looked upon as unfriendly or otherwise affecting the good relations of these States *inter se*. It would thus be left to the good sense of each State of the Empire to say what citizen rights shall be enjoyed, and by whom, within their terri-

torial jurisdiction, and no State of the Empire should have claim to force its citizens on any other State or resent their exclusion or special treatment by the latter.

J. C. SMUTS.

South African Delegation, Savoy Hotel, W.C. 2,
October 18, 1923.

APPENDIX VI

PAPERS REGARDING NATIONALITY QUESTIONS

Part 1

MEMORANDUM PREPARED BY THE COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE, 1923

The Commonwealth Government desires to make certain amendments in the Commonwealth *Nationality Act* 1920-1922. This Act gives effect, within the Commonwealth, to the system of Empire naturalization introduced by the British Act, the *British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act* 1914-1918. As the British Act was framed in consultation with the Dominions, the Commonwealth Government desires that the amendments now suggested should be discussed at the forthcoming Imperial Conference.

The amendments desired relate to:—

(A)—The constitution of the tribunal to which cases of revocation of naturalization are referred for enquiry.

(B)—Re-admission to British nationality of British-born women married to aliens.

(C)—Naturalization of Residents of "B" and "C" Mandated Territories.

(A)—CONSTITUTION OF THE TRIBUNAL TO WHICH CASES OF REVOCATION OF NATURALIZATION ARE REFERRED FOR ENQUIRY

By section 7 of the *British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act* 1914-1918 the Secretary of State is given power to revoke certificates of naturalization for the various classes of reasons set out in that section. In some of these cases he is given discretion, and in others he is required, before making an order of revocation, to give the person whose certificate is proposed to be revoked an opportunity of claiming that the case be referred for enquiry to a committee presided over by a person who holds or has held high judicial office, or to the High Court.

Section 8 of the British Act provides that, if the scheme of Empire naturalization is adopted by a Dominion, the Dominion shall have the same powers of revocation, there being substituted for "High Court," in section 7, the words "High Court or Superior Court" of the Dominion.

The Commonwealth *Nationality Act* 1920-1922, conforming to the British Act, confers on the Governor-General similar powers of revocation, and provides that the corresponding enquiries shall be held by a Committee presided over by a person who is or has been a Justice of the High Court of Australia or a Judge of a Supreme Court of a State or the officer holding the principal judicial office in a Territory, or by the High Court of Australia.

The classes of persons thus designated as competent to preside over a committee of enquiry hold offices in the Commonwealth which correspond to

those named in the British Act. It has been found, however, that in remote parts of the Commonwealth it is sometimes very difficult to arrange for a president qualified under this section. To facilitate the holding of enquiries, the Commonwealth Government desires to amend the section to provide that a committee of enquiry may be presided over by a Judge of a District Court or of a County Court (these being courts the jurisidiction of which is inferior to that of the Supreme Courts and which sit in parts of the Commonwealth not visited by Judges of the Supreme Courts) or by a special or stipendiary magistrate (that is, a magistrate having professional qualifications who sits in a court of minor jurisdiction).

Before making this amendment, it is desired to have the concurrence of the Governments of the other parts of the Empire which have adopted the scheme of Empire naturalization.

(B)—RE-ADMISSION TO BRITISH NATIONALITY OF BRITISH-BORN WOMEN MARRIED TO ALIENS

The *British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act* 1914, Part II of which has been adopted by the Commonwealth *Nationality Act* 1920-1922, provides that a Certificate of Naturalization shall not be granted to any person under "disability," the definition of which term includes "the status of being a married woman."

This provision has, in the Commonwealth, resulted in the infliction of considerable hardship upon certain women of British birth who have married aliens and been deserted by them, but who are nevertheless not eligible to re-acquire their former British nationality.

As an illustration, the case may be cited of a woman born in England who emigrated to South Australia where, in 1885, she married a German. In 1912 her husband deserted her and returned to Germany. Since his departure he has not written to her, not sent her money, and she has had to earn a living as best she could. She was the mother of ten children. The eldest son served in the Light Horse in the late war, and returned to Australia a cripple. In 1920 the woman had a paralytic stroke and was ill for a considerable time, and partially lost her memory. Fourteen of her male relations, including sons, grandsons, and nephews, served in the late war, and three of them were killed, yet this woman is not entitled to the privileges of a British subject.

Other women of British birth married to aliens have also been deserted by their husbands or been separated from them and have been precluded from exercising privileges which they enjoyed prior to marriage.

In this connection attention is invited to the war-time provision of the British Act, and the corresponding section 18 (3) of the Commonwealth *Nationality Act* 1920-1922, which permits of the re-admission of married women to British nationality *where the husband is a subject of a State at war with His Majesty*.

Although this provision is applicable only during war time, it establishes a principle which it is thought might, with advantage, be extended to British-born women in meritorious cases at all times.

The Commonwealth Government desires to ascertain whether the Imperial Government and the Governments of the Dominions which have adopted Part II of the British Act would be agreeable to an amendment which would confer upon British-born women the right of re-acquiring British nationality in cases where they have lost such nationality through marriage with aliens and have been deserted by their husbands.

In this connection it is pointed out that if the power under section 5 (2) of the British Act (and section 10 (2) of the Commonwealth Nationality Act)

to grant naturalization in special cases to "minors," who are as a class subject to the same general "disability" as "married women," were extended to cover "married women of British birth," all requirements would be met.

(C.)—NATURALIZATION OF RESIDENTS OF "B" AND "C" MANDATED TERRITORIES

The Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations, at its session in August 1922, adopted for submission to the Council of the League a resolution that Mandatory Powers to which "B" and "C" Mandated Territories have been entrusted might make arrangements, in conformity with their own laws, for the individual acquisition of their nationality by inhabitants of these territories.

The Commonwealth Government is advised that under the existing law British nationality cannot be acquired by residents (not being in the service of the Crown) of mandated territories. It accordingly suggests that the British Act should be amended so that residence in a "B" or "C" Mandated Territory should count as residence in His Majesty's Dominions, for the purpose of qualifying by residence for naturalization. When the British Act has been amended, a corresponding amendment can be made in the Commonwealth Act.

PRIME MINISTER'S DEPARTMENT,
MELBOURNE, July 26, 1923.

PART 2

GRANT OF NATURALIZATION TO PERSONS RESIDENT IN MANDATED TERRITORIES

JOINT MEMORANDUM PREPARED IN THE HOME OFFICE AND COLONIAL OFFICE

The Commonwealth Government have asked that the question of amending "The British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act, 1914," so as to permit of the grant of naturalization to persons resident in mandated territories may be brought before the Imperial Conference. It is understood that the Commonwealth Government have in mind Imperial naturalization, and the amendment which they suggest is one to the effect that residence in "B" or "C" mandated territories should count as residence in His Majesty's Dominions for the purpose of qualifying by residence for naturalization.

2. In this connection, the Commonwealth Government have referred to the proposal submitted to the Council of the League of Nations by the Permanent Mandates Commission in August 1922, which was in the following terms:—

> "It is open to mandatory Powers to whom 'B' and 'C' mandated territories have been entrusted to make arrangement in conformity with their own laws for the individual and purely voluntary acquisition of their nationality by inhabitants of these territories."

3. The matter was considered by the Council of the League in April, 1923, and the following resolutions were adopted:—

(1) The status of the native inhabitants of a mandated territory is distinct from that of the nationals of the mandatory Powers, and cannot be identified therewith by any process having general application.

(2) The native inhabitants of a mandated territory are not invested with the nationality of the mandatory Power by reason of the protection extended to them.

(3) It is not inconsistent with (1) and (2) above that individual inhabitants of the territory should voluntarily obtain naturalization from the mandatory Power in accordance with arrangements which it is open to such Power to make with this object under its own law.

4. Hitherto naturalization, except on the ground of service under the Crown in foreign countries, has depended on residence in British territory, and it has been considered undesirable to allow naturalization on account of residence in protectorates on the ground that it is contrary to sound principle to exercise such a high right of sovereignty as that involved in changing the nationality of an inhabitant in a territory which does not form part of His Majesty's dominions. Only two exceptions to this principle have been admitted, namely, in Southern and Northern Rhodesia, where *local* naturalization has been provided for by Orders in Council.

5. If provision is to be made for Imperial naturalization in mandated territories, and it would appear from the resolutions of the Council of the League of Nations quoted above that the League entertains no objection to this as regards "B" and "C" mandated territories, it will be necessary to make similar provision in protectorates to which these territories are analogous.

6. The position is different as regards protected States where there are local rulers and the native inhabitants are subjects of those rulers. It would hardly be possible for His Majesty to take power to enable such subjects of the local rulers to transfer their allegiance to himself, and even if naturalization in such territories were confined to persons who were not subjects of the local rulers it is probable that the local rulers would object to such action as an infringement of their own sovereign rights and powers. Somewhat similar objections would apply to a proposition to provide for Imperial naturalization in "A" mandated territories, the position of which is analogous to that of protected States.

7. If a general desire is expressed for such a change in the law as is proposed by the Commonwealth Government, the most convenient method of procedure would appear to be that, when next legislation amending the Act of 1914 is introduced, provision should at the same time be made enabling the Act to be applied by Order of His Majesty in Council (or, in the case of territories mandated to Dominions, Order of the Governor General in Council), to the territories in question, subject to such modifications and adaptations as may be necessary. Having regard to the difficulty which arises in connection with protected States and "A" mandated territories, it would be desirable not to provide generally for the application of the Act to "any territory under His Majesty's protection or in respect of which a mandate on behalf of the League of Nations has been accepted by His Majesty," but to provide for its application to certain individual territories specified in a schedule to the Act. This schedule would include "B" and "C" mandated territories and most of the protectorates, as to which no difficulty in regard to sovereignty occurs, but would not include "A" mandated territories or protected States.

8. *Nationality of Children Born to British Subjects in Mandated Territories.*—Somewhat similar considerations underlie another question which arises out of the scheme for the continuance of British nationality amongst successive generations born abroad contained in "The British Nationality and Status of Alien Act, 1922." It would appear that, as regards the children of British subjects born in "B" and "C" mandated territories, there is no neces-

sity to go through the procedure contemplated in the Act of 1922 in order that they may obtain British nationality at birth and retain it at majority. It would seem that they are to be deemed to be "born in a place where by treaty, capitulation, grant, usage, sufferance or other lawful means His Majesty exercises jurisdiction over British subjects," and they therefore acquire British nationality at birth in their own right under the proviso to section 1 (1) of the Act of 1914, as amended in 1922. Children born in protectorates appear to be in the same position. On the other hand, children born in protected States and in "A" mandated territories would appear not to acquire or retain British nationality except in pursuance of the procedure laid down in the Act of 1922 in regard to registration at birth and assertion of British nationality at majority.

September 10, 1923.

Part 3

NATIONALITY OF MARRIED WOMEN

Memorandum prepared in the Home Office

1. The Commonwealth Government have asked that the question of the readmission to British nationality of British-born women married to aliens may be placed on the agenda of the Imperial Conference.

2. Whether the cases which the Commonwealth Government have in mind are confined to those of women who have been abandoned by or for some reason have been permanently separated, but not divorced, from their alien husbands, or whether they include also cases of British-born women living with their alien husbands, the discussion of the question must necessarily bring into consideration the general question of the nationality of married women which has attracted considerable attention in recent years, both within the British Empire and in certain foreign countries.

3. The existing British law relating to the nationality of married women is statutory, and is based on the principle of a common nationality for husband and wife. The matter was first dealt with, partially, in "The Naturalization Act, 1844," next, more completely, in "The Naturalization Act, 1870," and now by section 10 of "The British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act, 1914," in which the general rule is expressed as follows: The wife of a British subject shall be deemed to be a British subject, and the wife of an alien shall be deemed to be an alien.

This rule is followed by the majority of civilized countries, though the Legislature of the United States of America has recently reversed it.

4. Previously to the statutes quoted and under the common law of England, British nationality could neither be acquired nor lost by marriage. This position does not seem to have been the result of any deliberate policy of the law in favour of independent nationalities for husband and wife, but followed incidentally from the application of the two general rules which at common law governed our nationality law. Thus, in the first place, women, equally with men, were subject to the general rule *nemo potest exuere patriam*, and as the result of this rule a British woman could not divest herself of her British nationality by the voluntary act of marriage. Secondly, the principle governing the acquisition of British nationality at common law was "birth within the allegiance," and British nationality could not be acquired in any other way. To this rule the voluntary act of marriage was no exception, and accordingly an alien woman did not at common law acquire British nationality on marriage to a British subject.

5. To the above general rule, quoted from the Act of 1914, there are certain important exceptions (some contained in the Act of 1914 originally and others introduced by the amending Act of 1918). These exceptions are:—

(*a*) Where a British subject, during the continuance of his marriage, becomes an alien by naturalization or otherwise his wife can remain British if she makes a declaration of her desire to do so ("British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act, 1914," section 10).

(*b*) The British-born wife of any alien who is the subject of a State at war with His Majesty can become British by the grant of a certificate of naturalization upon a declaration by her that she wishes to resume British nationality. (Amendment of section 10 of the above Act by the Act of 1918.)

(*c*) The wife of a naturalized British subject whose certificate is revoked retains her British nationality, unless the order of revocation directs that she shall cease to be a British subject. (Section 7A of the principal Act inserted by the Act of 1918.)

6. In April, 1922, a Bill was introduced into the House of Commons by Sir John Butcher, in which it was proposed to make important alterations in the existing law, and to provide *inter alia* that a British woman shall not lose her British nationality by marriage with an alien, and that an alien shall not acquire British nationality merely by marriage with a British subject. This Bill was referred to a Select Standing Committee of the House of Commons for examination and report, but the proceedings of the Committee were interrupted before any report was made by the dissolution of Parliament.

7. In 1923, on the motion of Sir John Butcher, a Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament was appointed "to examine the British law as to the nationality of married women; to consider in their legal and practical aspects the questions involved in the possession by husband and wife of the same or of different nationalities; and, with due regard to the operation of the laws of foreign countries, to report what, if any, alteration of the British law is desired."

8. This Committee, after hearing a considerable amount of evidence, was unable to agree as to the form of a report. The proceedings of the Joint Committee have not yet been published,* but advance copies of a portion of the proceedings containing two alternative draft reports which were laid before that Committee (one by the Chairman and one by Sir John Butcher) have been secured for the use of the Imperial Conference and are annexed hereto. These draft reports disclose numerous considerations which may be advanced in favour of or against any substantial alteration of the existing law.

9. A summary of the points and arguments urged in favour of an alteration of the law will be found in paragraph 9 of the Chairman's report. It may be stated generally that the main arguments proceed from (*a*) the demand of various women's organisations that married women should have the same right as men of individual choice and self-determination in respect of their national status; and (*b*) the special grievances of British-born women who have become aliens by marriage, and are subject, as such, to certain disabilities and incapacities (*e.g.*, franchise disqualification).

10. As regards (*a*) it has to be considered *inter alia* whether the theoretical value of the principle of self-determination is not outweighed by the practical disadvantages (affecting, *inter alia*, the children) involved in a difference of nationalities between the parents, disadvantages ranging from the regions of

*Since published as House of Commons Paper No. 115 of 1923.

diplomatic protection and private international law to the position of the family as a unit of society (see paragraphs 10 and 11 of the Chairman's report and the second section of Sir John Butcher's report).

11. As regards (*b*), it has to be considered whether the disabilities and incapacities in question are such as to justify a change in the law of nationality, or whether a remedy for most, if not all, of the grievances of British-born women cannot be found in specific legislative provisions dealing with the particular subject matter (see paragraphs 10 (i) and 14 of the Chairman's report).

Home Office, October, 1923.

PART 4

VALIDITY OF MARRIAGES BETWEEN BRITISH SUBJECTS AND FOREIGNERS

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES AND THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

(a) *From the Governor-General to the Secretary of State*

(No. 381.)

SIR, October 4, 1922.

I have the honour, at the instance of my Prime Minister, to inform you that a question has been raised in regard to the validity of marriages contracted between Australians and foreigners.

It is thought that it would probably be within the powers of the Commonwealth Parliament to enact that all such marriages shall be valid, but that validity would probably not be recognized outside Australia if the foreigner was not, by the law of his country of domicile, capable of contracting the marriage. Such legislation, however, would not go far to improve the position, and, while Imperial legislation extending to all the Dominions would advance matters a little further, it is considered that it would be inadvisable to interfere with the established rules of international law in this connection.

In order that some action might be taken which would lead to a satisfactory settlement of the question, my Ministers have suggested that His Majesty's Government might be asked to consider the desirability of discussing the matter at an Imperial Conference, with a view to international arrangements being made which would be acceptable to all parties concerned and I should be glad if you would be so good as to take the necessary steps to give effect thereto.

I have, etc.,

FORSTER.

(b) *From the Secretary of State to the Governor-General*

(No. 133.)

MY LORD, April 6, 1923.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's despatch No. 381 of the 4th October regarding the validity of marriages contracted between Australians and foreigners, and to request you to inform your Ministers that the question of the validity of marriages between British subjects and foreigners has on many occasions in the past formed the subject of consideration by His Majesty's Government.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 37a

2. As regards such marriages contracted in foreign countries according to the *lex loci*, it has long since been found necessary, in order to satisfy the requirements of foreign marriage laws, to authorize His Majesty's consular officers to issue certificates in individual cases, varying from a statement that the publication of banns in this country is not required in the case of such marriages, to statements that, the parties having gone through the antecedent formalities required by law for enabling them to be married at His Majesty's consulate under the provisions of the Foreign Marriage Act, 1892, there is no obstacle to the celebration of their marriage. Certificates according to the particular requirements of the foreign law concerned have in this way for a good many years past been issued by His Majesty's consular officers in France, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, Hungary and Sweden. On the other hand, in the case of marriages contracted in this country the French Government have since 1904 authorized French consular officers in this country to issue certificates to French citizens marrying British subjects to the effect that the formalities of French law have been complied with, while in the case of Belgium, by an agreement of November 1888, a similar certificate is issued by the Belgian legation.

3. Under the provisions of the Foreign Marriage Act, 1892, and of the Foreign Marriages Order in Council, 1913, His Majesty's consular officers are in many cases empowered to solemnize marriages between parties of whom one is a British subject. This Act and Order in Council form the subject of Chapter XXX of the Consular Instructions. In this connection reference is invited to Viscount Milner's despatch Dominions No. 506 of the 17th December 1920, and connected correspondence, as to officers who are empowered to issue the certificates required by Article 10 of the Foreign Marriages Order in Council, 1913. I enclose a copy of a printed memorandum,* which, while summarizing in a convenient form the formalities to be observed under the Act and Order in Council, exhibits also information which has been compiled as regards foreign *lex loci* marriages and marriages between British subjects and various classes of foreigners. Copies of this memorandum were forwarded in the late Viscount Harcourt's despatch No. 468 of the 30th July, 1914.

4. On the 29th November, 1906, " The Marriage with Foreigners Act, 1906 " (6 Edward VII, Chapter 40), was passed. This Act in section 1 provides that any British subject desiring to be married in a foreign country a foreigner according to the law of that country may give notice to the Registrar, or if abroad to the marriage officer (*i.e.*, His Majesty's consular officer), and apply for a certificate that after proper notices have been given no legal impediment to the marriage has been shown to exist. In section 2, as regards marriages in the United Kingdom, it is provided that, where arrangements have been made with a foreign country for the issue by the proper officers of that country of certificates that after proper notices have been given no impediment according to the law of that country has been shown to exist, His Majesty may by Order in Council require the production of such certificate before the marriage can be solemnized. Section 3 provides for the issue of an Order in Council making general regulations prescribing the forms to be used.

5. After the passing of this Act a considerable correspondence, which extended over several years, took place with foreign Governments with a view to ascertaining the possibility of giving effect, in the case both of sections 1 and 2 of the Act, to the arrangements contemplated. While it was found that in the case of some countries a certificate of the nature conemplated by section

---

* Foreign Office Memorandum, entitled " Marriages Abroad and in the United Kingdom ": not reproduced.

1 was unnecessary, and that, in the case of some, no arrangements of the nature contemplated by section 2 were possible, the correspondence showed that in the case of a number of foreign countries such arrangements were possible, though the requirements of the various foreign laws created difficulties as to the forms of certificates which would be required. Concurrently with this correspondence His Majesty's Representatives abroad were instructed to obtain and communicate to the Foreign Office the texts of the marriage laws of foreign countries, with a view to a more complete study of the question, and these laws as received were translated, and have been published in Parliamentary Paper Miscellaneous No. 11, 1911 (Cd. 5993), of which a copy is enclosed.

6. As the outcome of the correspondence referred to above, the preparation of the form of certificate to be given by the Registrar (and *mutatis mutandis* by His Majesty's consular officers) under section 1 of the Act of 1906 was commenced, but various difficulties have so far delayed its completion. When this has been done it will be possible again to approach foreign governments in the matter and to endeavour to bring about the further arrangements contemplated under section 2 of the Act.

7. It is noted that Ministers suggest that the matter might be discussed at an Imperial Conference, and a copy of the correspondence is accordingly being sent to the other Dominions and to the Secretary of State for India.

I have, &c.,

DEVONSHIRE.

APPENDIX VII.

ADDRESS BY HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJAH OF ALWAR, ON THE DUSSEHRA FESTIVAL, OCTOBER 19, 1923

The MAHARAJAH OF ALWAR: Prime Minister and Friends, it is a curious coincidence, I hope a happy coincidence, that to-day in this room we should be discussing questions relating to Military, Naval and Air matters, all connected with the defence of the Empire, on the exact day when in India is being celebrated our greatest festival of the year.

It is a festival to commemorate the march of Shri Ram, one of our greatest incarnations, to Ceylon where he achieved victory. The anniversary is celebrated nowadays in India inspecting our Military troops and units, in other words, examining the means of war, or, more correctly speaking, the means of peace.

We may thus in a sense be celebrating the Dussehra festival to-day by examining the means of Defence of our Empire.

Friends, I wish you all in the name of my country as an Indian, in the name of the Princes as one of their Order, our cordial and sincere Dussehra greetings to each and all of you.

Let us hope that this quiet, almost unostentatious, work that we are doing, or trying to do, will lead to co-ordination and co-operation of all the forces of the Empire to secure real peace, not only within, but also without.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 37a

APPENDIX VIII.

REPLY FROM HIS MAJESTY THE KING, EMPEROR OF INDIA, TO THE ADDRESS FROM THE CONFERENCE

IT has been a great satisfaction to the Queen and myself to receive from the Prime Minister of Great Britain the Address presented by the Members of the Imperial Conference at the close of their sessions. We thank you most cordially for these inspiring words.

The last few weeks have given me a happy opportunity to renew personal touch with some of my Ministers from the Overseas Dominions, and of making the acquaintance of others on whom their present high responsibilities have fallen since the last Conference.

As Emperor of India, I welcome the Members of the Conference from that great country. I know that its many peoples will rejoice that the problems brought on their behalf to the attention of the Conference have been dealt with so fully and sympathetically.

No one can follow closely, as I have done, the work of successive Conferences without realizing the immense value of such Meetings. First comes the spread of mutual knowledge of the conditions obtaining in all parts of the Empire, then the increase of good feeling that springs naturally from such knowledge, and, lastly, the hearty desire to co-operate in strengthening the bonds which unite us, so that, however distracted the world may be, the British Commonwealth shall stand steadfast and undismayed.

I thank you one and all for your labours. I am confident that these will redound to the security, happiness and prosperity of all the nations and peoples of my Empire.

GEORGE *R.I.*

NOVEMBER 14, 1923.